

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 714

HE 004 759

AUTHOR Woolfolk, E. Oscar, Comp.; Jones, Sherman, Comp.
TITLE Curriculum Change in Black Colleges: A Report on the
Cooperative Academic Planning Curriculum Development
Conference (Atlanta, Georgia, April 19-21, 1972).
INSTITUTION Institute for Services to Education, Washington,
D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Higher Education (DHEW/OE), Washington,
D.C.
PUB DATE May 72
NOTE 191p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; *Curriculum Development;
*Educational Change; *Higher Education; *Negro
Colleges; *Negro Education

ABSTRACT

This report includes the presentations of the various speakers at the first of four conferences entitled "Curriculum Change in Black Colleges." Presentations concern the need for a new college; a focus of curriculum redesign in the black college; new directories in black colleges; de-parochializing general education; some basic issues of general liberal education; black college renaissance: an academic blueprint for the new black student; developments in non-traditional study; factors affecting effective curriculum developments; and implementation of curricular change. A related document is HE 004 758. This document was published through the Technical Assistance Consortium to Improve College Services (TACTICS). (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES
TO EDUCATION

ED 082714

CURRICULUM CHANGE IN BLACK COLLEGES

A Report on the Cooperative Academic Planning
Curriculum Development Conference

Prepared by

E. OSCAR WOOLFOLK
SHERMAN JONES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 004759

Atlanta, Georgia
April 19-21, 1972

INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION
2001 S STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

President:

Elias Blake, Jr.

Vice President:

Frederick Humphries

The Institute for Services to Education (ISE) was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1965 and subsequently received a basic grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The organization is founded on the principle that education today requires a fresh examination of what is worth teaching and how to teach it. ISE is a catalyst for change. Under grants from government agencies and private foundations, ISE undertakes a variety of educational tasks—working cooperatively with other educational institutions. It does not just produce educational materials or techniques that are innovative; it develops, in cooperation with teachers and administrators, procedures for effective installation of successful materials and techniques in the colleges.

Director of Cooperative
Academic Planning Program:

E. Oscar Woolfolk

Assistant Director:

Sherman Jones

Research/Administrative
Assistant:

Gwendolyn Franklin

The Cooperative Academic Planning (CAP) Program, under the aegis of the Institute for Services to Education, is part of the Technical Assistance Consortium to Improve College Services (TACTICS) program which is funded under Title III of the Higher Education Act. This segment of the TACTICS program is charged with the responsibility to assist black colleges to improve their academic program planning.

ED 082714

CURRICULUM CHANGE IN BLACK COLLEGES

A Report on the Cooperative Academic Planning Curriculum Development Conference

Atlanta, Georgia
April 19-21, 1972

Prepared by

**E. Oscar Woolfolk
Sherman Jones**

**COOPERATIVE ACADEMIC PLANNING
INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION**

2001 S Street N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20009

May, 1972

FOREWORD

The office of Cooperative Academic Planning (CAP) is pleased to publish the proceedings of the conference entitled "Curriculum Change in Black Colleges," held in Atlanta, Georgia at Paschal's Motor Hotel on April 19-21, 1972.

This particular conference was the first in a series of four such conferences and workshops that this office will sponsor for selected faculty and staff who are intimately involved in curriculum leadership at twenty-five black colleges. This conference served, in part, as an orientation session for a two week residential workshop to be held in June at Bishop College. Its main purpose was to provide a setting in which representatives from the black colleges and informed speakers from the wider educational community could meet and exchange ideas with and among each other.

The overriding goal of this office is that such sessions can serve as forums which might lead to improvement of curricula at black colleges. The CAP office does not have a pre-conceived notion of what kinds of improvement are needed at particular colleges. That, in the final analysis, depends on each institution's special situation and needs. For this reason, a variety of positions on curriculum directions for black colleges was presented at the conference.

This report includes the presentations of the various speakers and selected excerpts (from reporter's take-down) from the discussions that followed each presentation. The speakers were selected both for their expertise in the area of concern and the variety of viewpoints which they represented.

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation to those who made the conference a meaningful beginning for what we hope will be a useful series of workshops.

E. Oscar Woolfolk
Director, CAP

Sherman Jones
Assistant Director, CAP

Washington, D.C.
May, 1972

CONTENTS

Participants and Observers	ii
Need For A New College	1
Elias Blake, Jr. , President of Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D.C.	
A Focus of Curriculum Redesign in The Black College	30
Henry Bullock , Professor, History-Sociology, University of Texas (retired)	
New Directions in Black Colleges	45
Herman Branson , President of Lincoln University, Pennsylvania	
De-Parochializing General Education	66
Albert Berrian , Associate Commissioner of Higher Education, State Education Department, New York	
Some Basic Issues of General Liberal Education	92
Harold Delaney , Acting Vice Chancellor for University Colleges, State University, New York	
Black College's Renaissance: An Academic Blueprint for the New Black Student	96
C. Sumner Stone , Reporter, Philadelphia Daily News and Former Director, Minority Affairs, Educational Testing Service, New Jersey	
Developments In Non-Traditional Study	114
Samuel Gould , Vice President, Educational Testing Service, New Jersey and Chairman, Commission for Non-Traditional Study, New York	
Factors Affecting Effective Curriculum Developments	139
Frederick Humphries , Vice President of Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D.C.	

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Implementation of Curriculum Change	160
Edward Brantley , Vice President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia	
Biographical Sketches	175
Conference Program	178

PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

Amelia Adams, South Carolina State College	Jeanette Cole, Saint Paul's College
June M. Aldridge, Spelman College	Halbert Crowder, Daniel Payne College
George Armstrong, Voorhees College	Bernard Cummings, Voorhees College
Grace Black, Fayetteville State University	Thelma Curl, Norfolk State College
James Bowser, Norfolk State College	Forest Davis, Wilberforce University
Elwyn Breaux, Langston University	Paul Decker, Bethune-Cookman College
A. Russell Brooks, Kentucky State College	Barbara De Grasse, Delaware State College
William G. Brooks, Lincoln University, Missouri	Kay Dennison, North Carolina Central University
Grace Brown, Miles College	Mary Drumm, Virginia Union University
W. C. Brown, Southern Regional Education Board	Everette Duke, Norfolk State College
M. Milford Caldwell, Delaware State College	Valarie Edmondson, Fayetteville State University
J. A. Campbell, Tennessee State University	James Ellis, Langston University
Edward L. Clark, Fayetteville State University	Willie Ellis, North Carolina A & T State University
L. Beatrice Clarke, Florida A & M University	Diana Ellison, National Urban League
Luana F. Clayton, Jackson State College	Dardanella Ennis, Grambling College
Emma Cleveland, Miles College	Lee Esprit, Wilberforce University

PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS (CONTINUED)

Richard Fields, Fayetteville State University	Floyd Holley, Elizabeth City State University
Mildred B. Ford, Voorhees College	W. H. Hollins, Alabama A & M University
Rabie J. Ganious, Bethune-Cookman College	Mary Hopkins, Lincoln University, Missouri
Sadie Gasaway, Tennessee State University	Joe Hopkins, Clark College
Franklin Gayles, Virginia Union University	Darlene Huddleston, Tennessee State University
James George, South Carolina State College	Clenor Hudson, Delaware State College
Patricia Gill, National Urban League	Robert Hudson, Tennessee State University
Louis Goodwin, Grambling College	George Hunter, South Carolina State College
Jocelyn Goss, Norfolk State College	Isabella Jenkins, Clark College
B. B. Hardy, Stillman College	Theodore Jennings, Grambling College
Faye Harris, Stillman College	Edward Johnson, Alabama A & M University
Ruth Harris, Virginia Union University	T. H. E. Jones, Saint Paul's College
Alferdteen Harrison, Southern University	Walter Jones, Langston University
Cleo Higgins, Bethune-Cookman College	David B. Kent, Jr., National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students
A. K. Hobson, Alabama A & M University	Charles Knight, Clark College
Antonio F. Holland, Lincoln University, Missouri	William Kornegay, Bethune-Cookman College

PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS (CONTINUED)

William Le Flore, Spelman College	Henry Ponder, Alabama A & M University
James Letton, Kentucky State College	Dave Ragan, Virginia State College
Howard E. Lewis, Florida A & M University	Walter J. Raymond, Saint Paul's College
Johnson Matchett, Miles College	A. J. Richards, Kentucky State College
Waltz Maynor, North Carolina Central University	Evalyne Robinson, Wilberforce University
Roch Mirabeau, Southern University	Angelia V. Rodriquez, Bishop College
Eunice Moore, Clark College	Richard Rollins, Bishop College
William E. Moore, Southern University	Virginia H. Russell, Saint Paul's College
Esther Moran, Southern University	John Ryan, University Associates
Lois B. Moreland, Spelman College	S. Joseph Shaw, North Carolina A & T State University
Vernon McDaniel, Bishop College	Charles Simmons, Norfolk State College
William McIntosh, Grambling College	Albert Smart, North Carolina A & T State University
Leslie B. McLemore, Jackson State College	Charles Smith, Florida A & M University
Leedell Neyland, Florida A & M University	Charlie J. Smith, Jackson State College
Segismundo Pares, Miles College	Estus Smith, Jackson State College
Nettie P. Parler, South Carolina State College	Melvin Smith, Norfolk State College
Bishop Paterson, Elizabeth City State University	Elbert Sparks, Stillman College

PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS (CONTINUED)

David Spitzer, Wilberforce
University

Alonzo Stephens, Tennessee
State University

Louise Stephens, Langston
University

Louise Sutton, Elizabeth City
State University

Thelma Thompson, Bishop
College

Julia Tidwell, Stillman
College

Alfred Wiley, Kentucky State
College

Jimmie Williams, North Carolina
A & T State University

CURRICULUM CHANGE IN BLACK COLLEGES

NEED FOR A NEW COLLEGE

Elias Blake, Jr.

Some people, I guess, have heard me talk maybe too many times and were probably a little chagrined that I was also starting this meeting. For example, some of the people I see in the audience have been to maybe four out of five of our summer workshops that we have every summer for six to eight weeks, and generally I'm the keynoter for that. And so there's only so much that a person can say because he's the same person.

But be that as it may, I have often talked in that context about the Thirteen College Curriculum Program (TCCP) and implications of that program. But since there will be other people following me who will deal in more detail with some of the curriculum problems and approaches, my approach will be to lay out why there is, especially among the predominantly black colleges, a very great need for them to look at themselves very hard to try to determine very much what their role, what their mission is to be and how that is to be projected into the future. This is a critical time, and I have made that comment in many instances and I will make it here again today in a specific context. Many of the things which I have often commented about over the last few years, while I would not like to make myself out a prophet, have now occurred and many of the things that I have been fearful of are now upon us. And it is also my belief that the only real, long-run protection for these questions and for these issues is for the institutions to develop strong and vigorous programs which can be presented in a way and in a format which can say that these are unique groups of institutions that serve certain roles, that serve certain purposes, that cannot be found anywhere else in higher education in the American social order. Running through my comments will be that particular theme over and over again.

As background, though, I would like to say first of all that it has been concluded by a variety of writers and observers from Paul Dressel at Michigan State to the U.S. Regional Laboratory for higher education in Durham, that very little substantive change has occurred in curriculum development. This despite the long seige of innovations laid to the walls of standard educational practice. What general observers

say is that there has been a lot of tinkering. But in terms of any basic structural changes, nothing has happened in things such as course credit structure, for example, or the roles the teachers play or the roles the students play in the institution or the nature of what is called a course in a college, or the way in which people move through an institution. These major kinds of issues, they maintain, simply have remained untouched despite the so-called innovations.

And I made a comment once about the Thirteen College Curriculum Program. That same criticism in many ways can be pointed at that program.

Sometimes I feel the TCCP fits too easily into the established structures of an institution, thereby not being as effective an instrument for at least forcing some questions about whether or not the old and the tried and the true ways are the best ways for the future.

On the opposite side, however, those who manage and run the instructional program—and I will comment first off that deans and presidents and administrators do not run instructional programs; senior faculties run them. Those who manage and run the instructional program can claim proud achievements in terms of past performance. This performance is in terms of professional, technical and intellectual sectors that appear solid enough to justify the status quo. Things do get done. The system is not falling apart at the seams. Graduates do get jobs. Graduates go on to graduate and professional schools. So what's all the business about innovation and change? "Are we not doing all right as we are?" say the instructional program managers.

The signs, however, that are pointed to as symptoms for a need for radical readjustment in higher education are as follows: First, the increasing numbers and the greater diversity of student populations in higher education. The fact that higher education is rapidly becoming less elite in its student population. The business of less and less selectivity, as it is commonly known in higher education (I would call it accessibility) is already a very forceful movement. Open enrollment which is taking place in some of the major state systems of higher education is also forcing this issue.

The second factor is a clear indication that the consumers of education, the students at all levels are schizophrenic about their education. They recognize its necessity but deplore its lack of stimulation, its irrelevance to contemporary issues and the chances for self expression. Students are, after all, practical, and they know that the game that higher education institutions run is the only game in town.

You either play by its rules or you don't play for any high stakes in the broader society. Therefore, whatever might be your deep feelings about your education, you decide early in your career that you had better get what you need in terms of your credentials and get on with it.

The third factor is the great and profound problems that have been left undone and unsolved by these professional, technical and intellectual planners. There are the issues of racial justice, of poverty, protection of the life-sustaining air, water and soil, the mechanization of human beings in an industrial state, and the lack of responsiveness of government institutions to the public interest. And these are great and serious problems that are on everyone's mind now.

The fourth factor that is pointed to is that in the midst of a technological revolution, specifically in producing and processing audio and visual information, the classroom is still using the limited oral medium of the teacher's voice and the limited verbal-visual medium of the printed page. The richness of the multi-media and three dimensional world of all people, young and old, has yet to be a part of the teaching-learning process. In the TCCP we asked the first generation of graduating seniors, "What was the primary form of instruction?" And you can predict what the response to that was. About 80 percent of the students said the primary form of instruction was the lecture. The same question could be asked at any institution in the country, and the responses would be the same.

The fifth factor is the continued breakdown of the large urban school systems which are fed by personnel created exclusively and totally by the higher education community. There is an increasingly general conflict by the children of the most affluent about the rigidity and authoritarianism of public school education even in their "good schools" where 70% or more go on to college. This system is also run by products coming out of a training monopoly run by higher education. What holds the public schools together appears to be two factors outside of the public school structure, much like braces on sagging walls; these are (1) the sure knowledge of the affluent student that he faces a deadend without the credentials, and he can't be a member in good standing of the middle class without appropriate educational credentials and that (2) in our big urban centers there is still the stubborn belief of the black community that either through legal suits or political control of votes that their children will be educated to wipe out inequities in income, housing and jobs. Nevertheless, these problems are approaching a national crisis.

These are the commentaries and signs that will probably be noted in much detail in the presentations following this one, because they are real, and the predicted conflict between outmoded educational practices and the new needs of the culture can only be resolved through educational change.

The needs of the culture are inexorable. They cannot be stopped by men or by institutions. Men and institutions must change before the inexorable tide or be crumbled and destroyed and become a part of the historical artifacts of another era. In other words, the forces that are building up in our society are not going to be respectful of educational institutions as they are now structured. These forces are much bigger than educational institutions, so there must be change. Educational practice is the side of the equation that has to yield.

But what does this have to do with predominantly black colleges? It is the cultural context within which their added burdens and opportunities for change exist. From the outset, I acknowledged the special schizophrenia of black colleges that match the way that other colleges do things but with a clientele who, by virtue of race and class, require they must do things that no other colleges do.

In this era of approaching conflict between educational practices and cultural needs, black colleges face new pressures never before a part of their problem of survival. They are in a sense continuing problems, but then there are new dimensions which are tacked on top of these which pose special and, I submit, serious problems for the predominantly black colleges. My perception is that the decade of the 70's is the critical decade in terms of whether there will be anything called a future for the predominantly black college. And I will develop that as I go along.

In this era of approaching conflict, some of the new things which are happening along with some of the old things are as follows: One, inequitable patterns of support are consistent with the past, but a new factor is competition for types of support from others who also educate large numbers of black students in new and different educational settings. For the first time, it may be that a majority of black students in higher education are outside of the traditional black colleges in the South. Note that I say "it may be," because I have a paper that I brought along that I did for the Congressional Black Caucus conference two weeks ago, and one of the questions that I raise is whether we know how many blacks are really in higher education. I submit we don't. Frankly I don't believe the census data. I've never seen any data

like those before, and I think that a lot of things are probably wrong with it.

But nevertheless, it is a fact that regardless of what the numbers are, for the first time in the history of the predominantly black colleges their monopoly on the education of black youths is broken, and it will never come back again. The new people also will compete for the same sources of support that these colleges must compete for. They do have quite large numbers of students outside of the South now.

Two, the justification I have mentioned was always in the context of how well a college did what no one else did; that is, educate large numbers of black youth. Whether or not they ought to be doing that job was never a question. They were the only alternative for the youth; they had to do it. Now that others educate large numbers of black youth, what then is the special role of a black college? Does it continue forever to have a special relationship to the black community, or does it project towards becoming just another excellent American college?

The third factor is that getting good, qualified staff was always a problem with inequitable support, but the paucity of other opportunities for black professionals was an aid to accumulating the largest single pool of black Ph.D's anywhere in the society. That is still true. But with pressure from students and the federal government to have more blacks on all college campuses, not only are there opportunities, but these opportunities for black Ph.D's and other professionals in higher education are at proportionately higher salaries than even comparably trained whites can command. In other words, there is a premium on well-trained, well-credentialed blacks in higher education, and they can command premium salaries. Therefore, almost all of the people on our campuses who are well-trained are in a seller's market, and therefore the old ways of holding these individuals will not do. Some new ways must be found if they are going to maintain themselves in these particular institutions.

However, depending on how one answers number two about whether there ought to be a special relationship of black colleges to the black community, the issue of holding blacks there may or may not be a problem.

Four, the national black community has always had a special need for these institutions to support their aspirations, and the national black community has in effect had its middle class created by the predominantly black colleges in the South. This is a black middle class of some stability and some substance, and this is a story that I think all

colleges need to do much more work on telling. For example, I think it is an issue of much importance that these institutions indicate that historically they have been national institutions and not regional institutions. This is something virtually no one in decision making positions in the American society understands. Now, I know this as a matter of fact. No matter if they ought to know it, et cetera, they do not know it. They just simply do not know it. So that this has to be something that has to be made very clear.

The new development is that the national black community now appears to need a new kind of leadership, at once more political and more committed to the intensifying of a broader and more sophisticated attack on unresponsive political, economic and social institutions.

The question then is: is there a special new national role for the black colleges to play in creating this leadership, or is that someone else's job?

The difference, then, between the black college and the white college as they face an uncertain future is that the new forces could destroy black colleges in terms of their actual financial collapse and closing or in terms of the physical and human resources, students and faculties, continuing as predominantly white institutions enrolling only 15 to 25 percent black students, and no longer dealing primarily with problems of the black community. This could come about by two interlocking circumstances. One, that private and public decision makers who control money and power could determine that predominantly black colleges are anachronistic, divisive institutions as far as an integrated society is concerned, and, further, that to concentrate so many student educational problems on single campuses is to make them insoluble. The logic of such a position would then be that one should move to create, in the physical place where these institutions now exist, a completely different kind of institution or to destroy them outright and have them closed down.

The second factor that could cause the demise of the predominantly black colleges is that the boards, administrators and faculties could decide that there is no more special role for them to play in relationship to the black community nationally, regionally or locally and that the so-called predominantly black colleges must become just American colleges serving everyone who comes. This decision, mind you, could be made by default. I am not talking about a conscious decision. I mean that this decision could be made by default in the sense that an analysis of the programs, the philosophy and the practices

of a predominantly black college make it indistinguishable except for the color of its students and faculty.

What is clear then, is that the decision making forces have already raised the question which I have put. There are forces moving toward a predetermined answer to that question.

If, then, one could see nothing special about these institutions except their racial composition, then how does one deal with this other issue, or the question is, ought one to deal with it? Ought there to be predominantly black colleges, and if so for how long? Should there be predominantly black colleges as long as black people are say, 12, 15, 16 percent of the American population?

These are basic questions which I think the time is upon us to come up with considered and astute answers.

It is my view that the survival of black colleges is directly dependent on their ability to enlist and activate the support of the national, regional and state level black communities. That support, however, can only come if it is clear that it is in the interest of the black community that the black colleges are supported. Only if the institutions represent places where growth can be achieved for the national or regional or state black communities that cannot be achieved elsewhere is there a possibility of that kind of support. In other words, this places me clearly in the camp of those who say that not to have an active educational program, highly visible and clearly serving in unique ways the black community, is to leave one's institution recklessly vulnerable to the destructive, anti-black forces now loose in the society up to the highest levels of leadership.

In the decade of the 70's there will be precious little middle ground for black-white issues. One's commitment must be clear, unequivocal and based on educational practices and programs, not rhetoric and lofty institutional objectives.

Without the support of the national black community, it is my considered opinion that the predominantly black colleges will be subjected to the same forces as predominantly black high schools. The scenario is as follows: One, it is pronounced—or it will be pronounced—that since racially segregated educational institutions are inherently not equal, any racially segregated institution must be integrated. So far, so good. But racial integration up to 1972 has been defined as a white racial majority in the student and faculty population of the school and with white educational leadership except in less than 5 percent of the cases. I feel strongly that such a limited definition is racist and another

form of white domination of blacks.

Three, since change of student population is harder to maintain with a white majority due to racial attitudes, it is easiest to attack faculty distribution. Then, even if the student population remains predominantly black, the faculty, through which the educational programs are mediated, will be predominantly white.

Four, the assumptions, attitudes and experiences of such large groups of predominantly white faculty people places the black student in considerable conflict with any such educational institution. Now, let me be explicit on this point, because some people have called me a racist for this statement. What I am saying is that there is not a predominantly white institution—that is, in terms of faculty—where the black students in that institution are not in conflict with the institution if they are relatively conscious at all. This is true in almost every college in the country where there is a substantial black minority on the campus. There are basic problems of perception of intellectual and social issues which they serve which will have to be worked out. A great many values of the predominantly white society denigrate black people, their scholarship and their life style. In the absence of very unusual whites, the negative view is put forward.

The conflict between the students and the white dominated educational institutions has been resolved at the high school level by expulsions and suspensions of black students. With college students, however, the scenario of conflict would have much more dangerous possibilities. A wave of institutional closings could occur after serious student strikes and demonstrations. Institutions could then remain closed until a reorganization pattern is in effect, dispersing black students into proportions small enough to be more manageable in terms of the pressures that they could bring on an institution to respect them and their heritage.

This again presumes that there are needs for predominantly black institutions in the society. That is the basic question which I think we all must come to and for which a rationale would be developed. This scenario is not paranoia; it is reality.

I would like to outline for you the plan for desegregation of Tennessee State University, which is now before a federal judge in the Sixth District Federal Court of the United States of America. And as of today, it is the only plan before this judge for him to rule on. If this plan for desegregation, which can be applied to public and private institutions which use large sums of federal money, then it forms a very

dangerous precedent. It is not law yet. It is before the circuit judge to rule on. It was put forward by the state of Tennessee after the judge ruled that only Tennessee State University in the public higher educational system of Tennessee was not making adequate progress toward a unitary system of higher education, because it had fewer white students than other institutions had black students. Yet, Tennessee State University has 14 percent white faculty while the rest of the system of Tennessee has less than 2 percent black faculty. The plan is silent on what the rest of the system in Tennessee must do. The plan proposes to achieve what the judge calls "a white presence" on Tennessee State University's campus. The judge used the language, "white presence."

To achieve a white presence, this is the plan that is now in the judge's chambers: (1) that no blacks be hired if equally qualified whites are available until the faculty approaches 28 to 30 percent white; (2) an exchange program be developed with other white schools near Tennessee State University with a \$1,000 dislocation allowance to be added to each exchanged person's salary. (3) a \$100,000 scholarship pool for the recruiting of white students. (4) a campus beautification program, ostensibly to make the campus more attractive to whites. Mind you, now, Tennessee State has been there now for 60 years with no need for special beautification.

Five—and this is unrelated, but I want to give you the whole plan; the University of Tennessee's extension program in the school of social work will be housed at Tennessee State University. It will not be administered by Tennessee State. The program will be run from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville which runs a competing white dominated institution just started in Nashville.

The background on this case is that four years ago some plaintiffs drew a suit against the building of a University of Tennessee campus in Nashville. They asked the judge to issue an injunction against the building of the campus. The same judge considering the above plan did not render the injunction. He allowed the campus to be built, so that there now is in Nashville a 3,000 student campus with about 92 percent of the enrollment white.

Now, the same judge then, in looking at whether state of Tennessee was desegregated, decided that the state was showing good faith except for Tennessee State, and so he asked for a plan. And the plan is what I have laid before you.

If the judge rules on this plan and it becomes a precedent in

federal law, it can be the beginning of the scenario I have proposed. In other words, I'm not paranoid. I am not trying to say that this is a crisis if this is not. It is a legitimate crisis for the future of predominantly black institutions in America.

The political power of the black community in the South is still in its infancy, and it can only increase. If black colleges are not the kinds of institutions that the mantle of political power will embrace and protect, then they are without protection in a hostile environment facing new and difficult challenges.

Now, what do I mean by this? I don't mean that the institutions themselves must become politicized. What I mean is that we have to become clear about the relationship between educational institutions and the need for political participation in order to strengthen and develop those institutions. If one looks at any state system of higher education, for example, the most handsomely supported public institution in each state has the most potent political interrelationship in that particular state, both in the legislature and in the halls of the private power brokers throughout that particular state. It's all very polite; it's all under the surface, it is never seen in terms of political participation, in terms of voting and political debate and so on. But nevertheless it is there.

These institutions are independent institutions. They carry out their educational programs as they see fit according to the way their faculties and administrations plan them, but there is an article of faith which exists between the institution and their political protectors that says "We trust each other, and if we help you we are assured that what you do in your infinite wisdom as educators will feed back to us and help us." And it is an unspoken bond. I am saying that in the South that bond has to be developed between the black citizenry of the South and the predominantly black colleges, public and private.

I fear that the predominantly black college community has allowed itself to be taken for granted by the black community in the South and in the nation. In no Southern state that I know of, for example, is the future of these institutions a common part of the political dialogue and a common and granted part of the kinds of political bill of particulars which are always lined up for comment. It is not, for example, an issue on which every politician, when he is running for office, must speak. There are issues in relationship to the black community in every state in the South on which any politician, whether he means it or not, has to speak to make certain that he does not

antagonize the rising political power in the South in the black community. The question I am posing is why are they silent on the future, then, of these valuable institutions, and believe me they are silent. It is not considered something that is at a high level of priority. That is your responsibility to make that happen. You have to generate it because it's not going to happen otherwise.

Now, what does this have to do with curriculum change? It means that a school has to take seriously its mission and role. It means that business as usual behind well-publicized fringe programs will not do.

I do not propose a single mission for all schools, but I do project that either a school is doing something for blacks that whites cannot or are not doing or it is not. And within that general guideline, a wide variety of missions and roles is possible.

This is not to argue that only blacks can teach blacks or for racial exclusion. It is to argue that where there is not black management and control of the educational programming coupled with a dominant black influence in the faculty, the probabilities of a college maintaining a special service role for blacks diminishes to almost zero. Black management and black influence mean the following things as primary to the educational direction of an institution regardless of the racial composition. The things in effect add up to a definition of a black college in other than the proportion of black students and faculty.

1. An absence of doubts about the inherent educability of black youth independent of their performance on conventional measures of academic aptitude such as college boards or other tests and a willingness to assume no limits on their future achievements.

2. An advocacy of a full range of educational possibilities for black youth leading to all levels of professional and technical functioning from teaching, to lawyers, to engineers, to doctors despite their entering characteristics.

3. A complete absence of any institutional conflict over program development for overcoming past educational deficits as a part of the responsibility of all faculty and of all instructional programs.

4. An understanding of the psychological and motivational backgrounds of many black students which come out of growing up in a society which does not respect non-white people and a willingness to deal with it where necessary.

5. A recognition of and adding of major components in all curricular areas which compensate for and set straight and exclusionary and racist content in standard higher education scholarship.

Omissions in scholarship express racism as much as poor scholarship.

6. Inclusion in the curriculum of conscious efforts, both in general education and in majors, to deal with the special relationship of black men to the institutions of American life, e.g., church and morality; the law and crime, punishment, and justice; education and access to jobs and professions.

7. Many opportunities to work on (by faculty and students) topics, projects, community services of primary concern to black people and their advancement in American life without conflict over the "legitimacy" or "appropriateness" of such activities.

8. Cultural and artistic programs in which black themes and black artists or scholars play a dominant role as a major part of the institutionally sponsored activities throughout the year. And an advocacy of the development of art, music, literature out of sources in the black community and its historical heritage.

9. Many opportunities for a wide range and a large number of black youth to participate in and help shape a full range of extra-curricular activities from student government, to cheer leaders, to leads in dramatic plays, to athletics, to newspapers, to academic clubs, to fraternities, to campus queens. The emphasis is on a wide range of abilities meaning not just extraordinary personalities in terms of ability and leadership. All participants in such activities are not leaders or "stars" but the opportunities for participation are an important part of development for future roles in life.

10. Its curriculum in summary emphasizes cultural pluralism, meaning a variety of cultural strains embodying unique values and perspectives as opposed to assimilation which assumes a single set of values toward which all groups would move regardless of their historical origins in disparate civilizations.

The focus is on such words as primary, major, all, conscious and advocacy in the ten items just listed as characterizing an institution. These characteristics do not focus on the racial composition of students and faculty, but it does assume at least a 50/50 ratio of black faculty and students with black management of overall programming. Most such institutions are likely to be majority black in faculty and students due to their mission orientation. The whites who do participate in such an institution as educators must, in large, agree with and be able to support such institutional directions, i.e., just as faculty at Harvard, MIT, or Oberlin give implicit support to their institution's directions. White students who participate at these "black" colleges will recognize

the opportunities for special service after graduation in the resolution of racial conflict and racial and class inequities in the American society.

A "black" college then is not racially exclusive but does have a history of having been created primarily for the education of black youth and wishes to continue via the mission orientation embodied in the ten above items primarily to serve the interests of the black community regardless of its changing racial composition, i.e. admitting increasing numbers of whites. Such a college would view the unequal status of black Americans as still needing special attention and intervention. It would through its graduates, black and white, provide manpower specially educated to be knowledgeable about how to change the status of black Americans.

The mission defines the institution more than the racial composition. It is possible, though not probable, for a majority white institution, with no special history or relationship to the issue of black-white conflict in America to embrace the 10 points. I view such a circumstance as highly unlikely. Institutions with a special history, as the traditionally black colleges of the South, can embrace such characteristics with much greater ease. My view is that insofar as an institution does not embrace the 10 points, any special relationship to black Americans is tenuous beyond its racial composition. Hence as the racial composition changes, the institutional service role is lost to the black community. If, however, as the racial composition changes the programs are guided by the ten points and this is highly visible to the black community, then any attempt to change the racial composition and the mission should be fought by the college in alliance with the community. Since racial exclusivity is not involved such a fight is legitimate and ought to be fought through to a positive conclusion. Otherwise, the black community will be stripped of higher education institutions primarily serving their special interests while other institutions all primarily serve the special interests of the white community. To say that institutions 70 to 85% white in faculty, students and administration and with no history in the black community will have as a primary goal the still desperate needs of black Americans is theoretically possible at some future date, but for the next twenty to thirty years is something of a fantasy. Too much racism and racial polarity exist to hope for such a possibility.

Only the most naive person, black or white, would say that the interests of blacks and the interests of whites do not still generate considerable conflict. To say the interests ought not to be in conflict is

to state a goal, but does not deal with the realities of the special efforts still needed by blacks to overcome blatant, overt, and intentional injustice and racism in American life. Black educators must not become confused about the need for some of them to pursue the interests of black youth from a position of dominance versus as the member of a submerged minority. It is not necessary, in the interests of Constitutional Law or in the long range interests of black men in America, for all institutions of education to be majority white. All institutions as biracial and as non-discriminatory is enough. It is idiocy to accept that only majority black institutions are racially identifiable and that only majority white institutions are "just schools." Some whites ought to be educated in a majority black setting because positive benefits derive to them from that experience if they are open to respecting the black heritage and life style.

What I will propose as the last part of my presentation, is a systematic approach for developing the mission and role that is not guided primarily by faculty wishes and desires. I will repeat that. A mission and role that is not guided primarily by faculty wishes and desires but, rather, by more lasting factors that can institutionalize new directions.

When people change, then programs based on a particular faculty mix lose their momentum. Programs based on the factors I will list will adjust themselves, and if a faculty is committed to the process of building programs, it will change itself as a function of the need to survive.

The systematic approach involves the following factors: First, an analysis of student characteristics — their academic, motivational, attitudinal, perceptual and demographic characteristics. What I mean by this is that academic abilities, both as measured by tests, such as the ACT or the SAT, but also by grades, and I would recommend by non-verbal tests. One of the interesting things we have discovered in the research we have been doing in researching college curriculum programs is that the performance distribution on a non-verbal test is a normal distribution with the average performance being a little bit above average. On other measures the students tend to score in the bottom range of any standardized test they are given. Their grades, however, also tend to be a normal distribution and to be above average.

The motivational traits means such things as how do the students perceive themselves in relationship to an intellectual environment? How do they view their own strengths and weaknesses?

What are the demographic characteristics of the student population? Where do they come from? What kinds of towns? What size high school? What was the racial makeup of the high schools from which they came?

Another characteristic of students that an institution should look at would be the attitudinal traits of students, with particular emphasis on issues related to race and class and what I might even call their philosophical outlook on issues of race and class.

The fifth characteristic would be to look at the students' perceptions of the institution itself. I would argue that an analysis of this kind of data would project certain logical inferences about how an institution must organize an educational program to serve that particular clientele. Again, however, if a school does not assume it will continue serving a high proportion of black students, then it might simply make a decision at that point to change the admissions policy to a more selective criteria and create a different student population. But if it is presumed it's going to continue into the future to serve similar kinds of clientele, then its educational program should be logical in relationship to that particular clientele.

The second analysis that an institution should make is of the institutional characteristics. The first factor under institutional characteristics would be the demography of the immediate geographic region, particularly in terms of the college age population with special emphasis on race and class, and then nearby and regional demographies ought to be looked at.

The room is not too well lighted so you may not be able to see this, but this is a table from the '70 census. It tells you where black people are in America. The reddish figures on the left indicate counties where 30 to 80 percent of the population is black. I'll just let you look at this at this time and let your minds wander a little about the demography of the United States and where black colleges are in terms of this demography. For example, what this shows is that there are 103 counties in the South which have a 51 percent or more predominantly black population, and a rough count indicated that there were over 200 other counties that had between 30 and 49 percent black population.

The question then becomes, will there be any systematic relationship between these institutions and the demography of the region, particularly in relationship to race and class?

I would also say that these institutions ought to look at what I call

distant but accessible demography in America in terms of their location. For example, the Texas private schools just as one subset, should look at the fact that Los Angeles has a black population in the 1970 census of 503,000 people. It has a black population of a half million in Los Angeles. It has 150,000 blacks in the public school system and 140,000 Chicanos. I don't know whether any of us are ever going to be interested in that other demography, but I think that those who are adjacent to or near to the southwest ought to begin to find out something about the Chicano demography in those regions. Some schools in the East should look at New York City, where it has a public school population of 335,000 blacks. That's one city—New York.

Or in Detroit 181,000 public school population and in Chicago there is a 308,000 black public school population. And in Chicago there are 1.1 million blacks, and over 600,000 blacks in Detroit. The question is: where is an institution in relationship to the future college-going population in its particular region? What is that population like? If that population, by focussing on race and class, appears as if it's going to be just like the population that you already have, then the whole business of the enrolling mission, as one projects for the next 20 to 30 years, again becomes critical, and I keep focussing on race and class issues because I think out of that would come some uniqueness. These colleges have historically served a racial and class group that found access to education difficult for reasons of racism and poverty.

The second factor I would look at was whether a school was in an urban or a rural setting, and whether a major urban center is nearby. But it should also ask itself some questions about its physical self. What are the problems or what are the strengths and weaknesses of the location of the school? Whether it is urban or rural, certain kinds of political and economic problems or issues should surface out of that kind of analysis.

What are the economic problems? What are the political problems? What are the manpower issues? A second kind of question is what are the educational strengths and weaknesses of the location of the school? And here I would make a plea for great perception in looking at rural areas. Rural areas are not without educational benefits, particularly in the social sciences and the new scientific interests in ecology, but I think it takes a perceptive view to realize that. In other words, let's take just an idea. It is an historical fact that the rural areas in which any predominantly black college is located is a rural area similar to the rural areas out of which came the fantastic migration or displacement of the black population in America. Let one's mind roam a little about the

educational possibilities for students in terms of looking at why that migration occurred.

Another factor: We lay claim and it is a fact that blacks dominate American music. That is, the musical strains from the black community dominate American music, and I will not qualify that statement. I will argue that with anybody—musicologists or anybody—the black American community dominates American music, period. The roots of that music came from where? The same rural areas, where almost all blacks started and everything spiraled up from that. Blues, jazz, many musical scores. Again, one is dealing with humanities, their sources, inspirations, directions. So I say one has to look at the location in terms of what it represents as an educational place.

The third factor that one has to look at is the educational competition. What other institutions are there nearby, and what are they doing, and what are they not doing in relationship to these other factors that one has begun to look at? It is likely that there are a great many things in relationship to black people and poor people that these institutions are not doing, or, if they are doing them, they are doing them only recently. And these institutions ought to have an advantage in terms of credibility and in terms of the competition for those kinds of educational programs with the black community, if these programs extend into the black community. And if one cannot compete, then it means that their perceptions of you are no different from their perceptions of the other institutions and that they perceive the other institutions as more capable of helping them deal with their problems than they see that you are. If that is the case, then for the future, as I have been saying, one's survival problem becomes more severe.

Now, out of these things, then, the institution looks at its size, the current size and the predicted size and why it should stay this size; should it get bigger; if it should, why? Can it be related to the demography, to the competition, to the issues that I have laid out as a systematic approach?

And then I come to the third factor which one should do an analysis of, and it is intentional that this came at the third level of priority—that is, the human resources or the teachers in an institution. One should look at their academic characteristics, their experience, their training, their background. They should be looked at in terms of their attitudinal characteristics, and there are ways in which people can look at this, especially their attitudinal characteristics as it relates to service to the kind of clientele and the kind of demography which

might give an institution some uniqueness and special strength.

These things can be done on a pencil and paper basis, but I think they can be done on face to face basis, too. In this, since you are dealing with such a sophisticated group, you will have to use what psychologists call "forced choices." In other words, not just what it would be good to do, but if one has two or three alternatives and you can only pick one, which one would you pick as you project towards the future, you see. If one had a choice between going on for the next 20 years and educating the same kinds of students or progressively upgrading the selection criteria, which course of action would you opt for as a course of action? Such forced choices indicate the chances for program development in a variety of directions.

The third thing would be some insight into the career plans and anticipations, but particularly of your younger faculty, because this is critical. We all know that on too many of our campuses too many of the faculty with Ph.D.'s are getting too far up in age. This is not to say that younger people can do anything better than older people, but it is true that they have more time to do it. And I think an institution as an institution must be very clearheaded about that kind of issue. If the average age of the faculty is 50 years, then that institution has a problem in terms of institutional continuity, and if one looks at just the Ph.D.'s alone, and the average goes up to 56 as the average age, then the problem increases in severity. So that what the younger faculty thinks, what they perceive about the institution and what they see about the kind of institution they want to be involved in is critical. It is critical to the problem of the marketplace, job satisfaction is a powerful factor in holding power. And then the faculty should be forced to give some sense of its perceptions of the institutions, too. So that this is the third part of the process that I think the institution should develop.

The fourth and last part of this process would be the history and traditions of the institution—not the rhetoric of the institution but its record; what has it stood for in past decades, and what has it accomplished?

Some institutions may well be ahistorical or atraditional institutions. They may have just grown like topsy. There are institutions like that that have never had any clearly honed or developed point of view as an institution. If that's true, that ought to be discovered. Other institutions should look to the 30's, the 40's and the 50's to find out what their history and tradition is because in my observation something strange happened in the middle 50's and

60's. The same transitional period that has brought predominantly black colleges to this crisis stage was in process in the last 15 years and those institutions which were clearly defined in terms of their history and traditions have become less clearly defined. In other words, there was an agreed upon consensus about certain kinds of institutions in the black college community. The institutions thought they were doing these things and were in fact doing them. The peers agreed that the people were doing these things, and the general broader society agreed that the institutions were doing these things.

Another reason for looking back some years is that the important alumni of your institution were there in those periods, and that's the institution that they remember. Therefore, if this kind of support base that I'm talking about is going to be developed, then an institution must in some way try to relate itself to what it has been as it projects what it wants to be. That is going to be critical when one begins to build support—financial or political—and your alumni is the biggest starting point, but they are going to be looking for the old school tie, and they are all very conservative in this regard, me included. Some things I see as good, but most things I am uncertain about as an alumnus of my undergraduate institution. I don't know whether with the new things they are taking on they haven't lost some of those old values that I perceived as tremendously important when I was an undergraduate. Now, if I become an influential alumnus and you want me to fight for you in Chicago and New York or Atlanta, then you're going to have to persuade me that you haven't thrown the baby out with the bath. Therefore, one has to build some scenario showing that this is, in some instances, a logical kind of progression.

Now, another point I want to put in as a caveat. If a large part of the *esprit de corps* of an institution has been based on successfully operated programs, that ought not to be overthrown. One ought not to make just an *a priori*, negative connotation about any kind of success.

Many institutions, including some of our most prestigious nationally, have used strong athletic programs as a cornerstone of the development of a relationship with their support groups in the society. One must not reject any weapons, and if one has a good athletic program, one should not all of a sudden dismantle it. Everybody knows who UCLA and Florida State are now except those people who are oblivious to national sports championships. And if the people inside your institution are oblivious to it, then again they should become a little more contemporaneous as to what goes on in the society. In other

words, these are the two teams who played for the national basketball championship on national TV, with around 30 million viewers. It doesn't hurt that the institutional name is carried into the homes of those 30 million viewers or whatever subgroup it will reach.

All of this is a process of self-analysis; the demography of the student body, their attitudes, their motivations, the institution as an institution, both as a physical place, as a place with human resources and the history and traditions of the institution.

I will end with three other factors that I think are critical, which are external things but very important. One, I think the social science departments in an institution should look at black people in general and their status in America and their current conflicts and confrontations. For example, it appears that there is a regrouping within the black community after what appeared to be some relatively naive concepts of what integration was going to mean in terms of the advancement of black people in America. I think that one would not argue that there is some kind of regrouping on this issue, a kind of pulling back, wanting to get a better definition of what this course means.

A second factor which is very clear is that there is a reforming of various kinds of institutional structures that were once thought to be anachronistic. For example, in the last two to three years, about 25 professional and higher education organizations have formed themselves along racial lines. Almost every professional organization in the country now has a black caucus, and the black caucus is moving to institutionalize itself as a parallel body to the national organization. I just came back here from the National School Board Association. They have a black caucus. They have between seven and eight hundred black school board members in America, and the number is going up rapidly every year. But, again, giving some of the projections to the future, these school board members could possibly get exterminated the same way that black high school principals were, because what some legal minds perceive to be the best way to make the 14th Amendment protect black people—that is, the metropolitan plans for public school desegregation, many of these board members are set against metropolitan desegregation. Why? They have been fighting in the political arena for anywhere from eight to ten years to get access to the political process and real influence on how decisions are made and monies are spent in the public school system of their city. Now they have that backed up by some political access on city councils and so on, and they

are raising the question, "Will we not be right back in the position we were 10 years ago within a metropolitan plan? Will the gains offset the losses of a certain kind of political power?" I sat on two different occasions with a black chairman of a school board and a black superintendent of schools, which was a new thing in my experience. I discovered that there are 35 black superintendents of schools in America now as a reflection of something of this process. The point I'm making here is that there has to be some look at what the future seems to hold in terms of alternatives.

My final point is, the South as a region, as a subpart of this, its present and its future significance to black people in American must also be looked at. Carefully in looking at the 1970 census data, the South in terms of the four regions, the South is the most populous region. It has 62 million people. The Midwest comes second with about 56 million, then it goes on down to the Northeast and West. What do these population patterns mean in terms of representation? For example, if it is true that 30 or 40 congressmen might be in congress in the next 10 years, at least half of those and maybe 60 percent of whatever the number will be will be from the South. What about the migration patterns? Will they be stabilized? Ought they to be stabilized? Should this network of institutions play a role in that?

Out of these things, I am saying one can determine a unique mission and a role. Why? Because no institutions do this. If you will go through this process, you will be doing something unique and creating something innovative in and of itself. I know of no institution that goes through the kind of process that I have just been talking about and tries to mold some programmatic directions.

New programs usually get brokered through in a kind of internal, political process between powerful faculty people. What one can do in terms of new programming or programming redirection is played off in a kind of political arena based on what people are doing now and what effect the new things will have on their ability to go on doing what they have been doing. That is what all institutions do, black and white. But my point is that the predominantly black colleges don't have the luxury any more of doing what all other institutions do. Predominantly black colleges are very much needed. I think that there are cultural problems, and there are value problems in this society that we need these types of institutions to deal with. The black community needs the institutional base that they represent in the private and the public sectors so that we do not misunderstand the importance of anything as important as

institutions and the service that they render. This is something that I think our younger social theorists overlook, that an institution does not have to have a so-called clear and open kind of ideological point of view that controls everything about it. If it exists and is capable of attracting onto itself a certain kind of critical mass of students and a certain kind of critical mass of faculty, then the mere existence or the coming together of those forces is likely to create something special and something unique for the black community in America.

But what I am concerned about is the maintenance of the physical and critical mass. If it is dissolved to the point where it cannot operate within its own house without extreme opposition, then the real force of an institution is dissipated. If it gets into a kind of ambivalent status in terms of whether its primary role and mission is related to the black community—though it will serve all races—or that becomes an issue of great argument, then that institution is likely to become ineffective if that issue is not settled. My own personal view is that without predominantly black colleges to continue to attack it, racism in America will flourish for much, much longer than any of us might anticipate. It is much too deep in the functioning of education for a gradual removal. Some counter forces must exist.

These institutions have been some of the few institutions in the society that have honestly, from their inception, been almost totally committed to an antiracist position and, therefore, to a kind of pro-human value position, though it was not articulated. But these schools had to go against the grain of elitist (racist) thought in their basic operation. One has to, for example, ignore the test scores if you are going to have any students at all. Now, whether one believes that is right or not, that is really irrelevant. That act expresses a certain value about human beings and their potential independent of what the test scores say. That is an illustration of what I mean by actions as opposed to rhetoric. I do not believe that if all of our higher educational institutions become predominantly white institutions that we are going to get the proportion of black youth educated in the next 20 years that we need to get educated. I just simply do not believe that will come to pass, and I think some of the currents in predominantly white institutions point that out.

Also, there will be predominantly black institutions and student populations developing in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Newark; it is inevitable. There is no way to avoid that. The population is there. The institutions are there; it is just

simply a matter of time. Then what will be the relationship of black colleges to these newly developing institutions. Or would you assume your schools have no relationship to them? Those institutions may well have predominantly white faculties, and they in turn will have special kinds of educational problems with the black youths in those institutions, that, would need to be resolved. Someone who comes out of a different educational context—namely, a predominantly black educational institution—could help those people deal with problems that they probably do not even understand very clearly.

That will only be true if you are doing something yourself, because if you are not, the ingenuity of those individuals is not to be underestimated. In the 1980's the faculties of predominantly black colleges will be going to Cleveland State and Wayne State and Newark State to be trained in the latest techniques for upgrading the educational problems of black youths. And there is no way to stop that unless the clearly articulated job I am talking about is done.

You can no longer say, "Well, yeah, we're doing it." You have to become adept at laying out exactly what you are doing and how you are doing it so that if anyone asks you, it is exportable. Or if anyone asks, "What are you doing? Why are you doing it?" these questions can be answered. That is the way that the other institutions are now approaching their problems of black students. And they are writing everything down. I mean they are publishing everything they do and keeping all kinds of data. Do you have a systematic approach? Are you keeping data? Are you developing, and keeping notes on what you're doing and so on? If you are not, then I would submit that in this particular decade these forces that I have talked about will dissolve these institutions as I know them and as you know them, and they will no longer exist.

Discussion

Question: About a month ago Mr. [Porter Laney] of the New York Times made a tour of a number of black colleges, and he seemed to be checking out a thesis—at least he said that was what he was doing—when he came to write the story, he didn't write it that way or the rewrite people didn't like it when he wrote it, so I think it came out as a rather innocuous theory, but what he said he was checking out was

the thesis that there are no black colleges left right now. In order to check this out, he would go around the campus and he would grab off a couple of students, nail them in the corridor or something, and he would ask them just a simple question: "Are the so-called black colleges really black any more?" And there would be this period of hesitation, and the students would say, "Well, maybe not."

Now, he had a thesis to start with, and maybe good reporters always do; I don't know about that. But I wonder what you would say about that kind of opinion?

Dr. Blake: Well, that kind of question has a certain kind of ideological base to it that assumes that people can agree on something called "blackness," you know, which is an attribute that people have and institutions have and that one is supposed to be able to recognize. I think that my concern would be with asking that question another way, and it was the way I put it: Is this institution doing anything that is special or that has special significance or relevance for black people, both the students who are in it and potentially for people that are close to it.

I think this would be the basic point. Now, one clear thing that all the institutions are doing is educating a population of students that are unlike any population of students in college anywhere else in the country, and over 90 some percent of them are black, so that in that sense, clearly the colleges are doing a special thing for the black community that no one else is doing. But that question implies another question; that is, are they doing it in a way which takes into account that they are black students, and that, too, black people are not white people, therefore they have different problems in the American social order, and does the educational process in any way take into account that they do in effect have different problems in the American society than white people?

And I think this last question, the people are often looking for some sign that what goes on on a black college campus is not in their image of what goes on on a white college campus; despite the fact that it has to produce certain basic technical competencies, people are raising the question that no educational institution is really neutral. It produces technical competence within a certain context and it influences its students in a certain attitudinal way.

And so I think the best way to ask that question is: is there any special way in which the institutions are influencing their students which might be unique?

Now, there are other questions in this which I think each institution has to answer; that is, whether or not it feels those are legitimate questions. Some institutions might assume that they are not. Now, I'm taking the point of view so that you will attack me. If an institution does not take the point of view that there are some special things about black people, that there are some special problems that black people have that white people don't have and that the institution that works in that area, in addition to the technical competence that it gives, then there is no reason for it to be called a predominantly black college, that it can just pursue its future any way it wants because what it is doing for black students anybody else can do, and they can do the same thing for white students. And, see, it has an extension of this. If the institution has white students, is it doing anything for its white students that a predominantly white institution would not ordinarily be doing. Is it giving them any special insights or any special help into their perceptions of the problems of black people, and so forth and so on, that they would not ordinarily get?

You see, I am taking the advocate's position in that otherwise the institution just goes on and becomes whatever it becomes.

Question: If we assume that there is some special reason for black colleges to exist, let's get beyond that, and we are looking at that simply as a group, then we also recognize that we are attracting similar constituencies in their demographic characteristics and motivations, et cetera, or our resources are similar, we are similarly locating geographically as institutions—historically there are similarities or there are degrees of differences. When we begin to try to pinpoint those uniquenesses among ourselves, we then begin to be competitive with each other, and I raise this question, looking at ourselves singly as institutions, because this particular question was raised by a — at a particular institution, looking at us first as a group, we can assume that it's a special proposition. Then when we begin to look at their uniquenesses and underneath all that the similarities, do we then begin to try to out-compete each other?

Dr. Blake: Well, there was one point at which I was saying one should analyze the location, in which I said that one should look at the educational competition. And one of the reasons for looking at the educational competition is to try to develop some things which are not necessarily specifically duplicating some programs at other institutions; now that's impossible to do 100%. There has got to be overlapping in all kinds of educational institutions, and I think that

would be the argument that I would make to anyone, that it's impossible to have, say, five or six institutions, and those five or six institutions are unique. You know, they are all going to be given measures which are similar and which are different, and so on, but I think that some of the internal dimensions of those programs are the things which can be quite different. There is no avoiding of the competition, I would say forthrightly. The problem is a larger one. What is the pool of resources that one is going to compete for? If the pool of resources is too small, then the competition is going to become destructive. If the pool of resources is large enough, then the competition becomes constructive. It might force an institution to do a few more things it might not have ordinarily considered doing because there is a possibility of more money coming in, and therefore of stronger programs being built.

But one of the problems which has plagued the institutions is that a lot of the programs never get the kind of, say, takeoff support that they need. So that even the new programs—a lot of people have questions about the quality of them because they know that they are not doing it at the level that they would like to be doing it. And that comes back to the competitive question for resources.

But, again, I think that relates to that logical question about how one makes resources available, that resources become available through a political and a quasi-political process. And when I say "political," I mean all kinds of ways in which ideas get in people's heads, and then later on they begin to act on the basis of those ideas. I view that as a political process, you see.

In other words, you see, it's done with knowledge and research, but it is also done with getting the results of the knowledge and the research talked about, passed around, brought back to—until the idea becomes something whose time has come. And then making the idea's time come regardless of how good it is, is a kind of quasi-political process that I take all of the institutions have to work on together, and then that in turn increases, hopefully. You know, if the idea becomes clear this is a special institution, it has a special role and mission, also it is doing special things in the American society that no one else is doing, generally, as a group that need doing badly. Then that's a strong case, you know, for pressing issues on all fronts.

Question: During this period of transition, isn't there a real danger that the black college is likely to dissipate many of its real energies in its effort to strive for uniqueness, to try to prevent any kind

of duplication of services within this state, that its programs could become weak and the real strong programs that it would have on its campus would lose much of their significance for building a strong college. For example, you have an accounting program. How do you really emphasize black accounting? And you could go on and extend this to many areas, and I think—

Dr. Flake: I can give you some suggestions. I mean I will answer that question directly. You can emphasize, you know, some accounting—you can put some emphases in your accounting program which are of special moment to black people. And that's unquestionable, that there are certain problems that blacks have in terms of business and becoming other than wage earners in the American social order; the small business, under capitalization—these are the classic problems, you see. Now, that's a general problem, but that problem falls with greater weight on black businessmen than it does on white businessmen. So you see if one puts those kinds of emphases and their applications in a program, then one's graduate would have, in addition to being able to work for Peat, Marwick & Mitchell or Arthur D. Little & Company, or what have you, he might be able to be working for them to do some special things in relation to the black people in America that another person might not, because he takes, as the principal, the ideal, you know, in terms of the basic economic and industrial and business structure of the society. You see, I'm saying that that's a certain kind of uniqueness, but that's also a partial answer to your other question.

I'm not always advocating, in what I'm saying, new programs that do not now exist on a campus; I did not intend to convey that meaning. I intended to convey that when one looks at his existing programs—for example teacher education, which has been traditionally a strong and big program, one asks the question, does this teacher education program do anything so that our teachers, when they graduate, are paid as people who have a higher probability of being successful, say, in big, tough, 2,000, 3,000 student city high schools, that we have given them some kind of training for operating in that kind of setting so that people know that if they want teachers to go to Jacksonville or to Miami, one of the best places to come is Florida A&M, because they have a program which develops teachers to operate in those settings. And when they say—you know, they mean schools that are really not educating black people very well. That's the big problem in public education. So I'm saying how can we, given our history of this institution, not really be relevant to that issue when we really put the

light of day on what we are doing. You see, we ask ourselves that kind of question about an existing program, you see, so I'm not saying always get new programs. But if you did that, that would be a unique program, but nobody's doing it.

Question: I would like to ask you a question. Do you think that the community or junior college has a role to play? I guess what I have in mind here is these programs in four year colleges and universities; what do you foresee as far as the community or junior colleges?

Dr. Blake: Well, I think they're here and they're growing. Like I say, when you can't beat them, join them. And I think that what one ought to do in terms of looking at—like when I said make an educational survey; if one has the institutions in one's immediate geographical area, one should not necessarily see them as a threat but as an additional source of students if you are a baccalaureate degree graduating institution. Now, some comments about that.

I was looking at some of the enrollments in community colleges, and I become very much concerned about what black students are doing in community colleges—you know, what kind of work program are they getting—and I have a hypothesis that I've been unable to document that a very high proportion of them are in the non-degree terminal programs, and this is based on the fact that I looked at Los Angeles and I looked at North Carolina, two different places, and in both places the institutions that have the largest absolute number of blacks and proportion of blacks also had the largest proportion of non-degree credit work. And I don't know whether those two things are related, because you can't find out at this point. You have to go around and ask the black students what kind of program they're in. If you join them—what I mean is, you impact those institutions—you indicate to the black students who are going into those institutions that, "Look here, we're named Wilberforce, and we live right over here and we give baccalaureate degrees. If you take certain kinds of things in this institution, you can get a baccalaureate degree from Wilberforce." And if you get into the junior college, whether the junior college likes it or not, and let the students know about you, let the students know what they're going to need to avoid a deadend. And it's not always true that they will stay in the junior college two years. You know, if what you are doing is really good enough and it sounds good enough and the first students who come go back and tell the others, then a lot of students are going to leave those community colleges in the middle of the first year, at the end of their first year, and transfer to a baccalaureate

degree granting institution, you see, and these cannot be overlooked as possibilities. But you as a baccalaureate degree granting institution can actually intrude upon and impact the program of a community college in a way that it might not be impacted for blacks, because, as I say, the signs are already out that a lot of the blacks are going to be beyond your help when they finish two years of a community college that they had just as well have to come in and start as freshmen or something, and they would not have really gotten the benefit of two years of post-secondary education with, say, two or three more to go for a baccalaureate degree and to get into professional and technical areas. And blacks are enrolling in these institutions, and I would say the schools in the South should also consider again relationships with schools outside of the South in the major cities to get students who finish in Chicago and New York and Philadelphia to consider coming South to these institutions, because blacks tend to be very practical. I know that if a black kid from Mississippi will go to a place called Franconia College in New Hampshire that a black kid from Chicago will go to a black college called Talladega in order to get what he wants. So I think that we have to use that as another thing that we can work on.

A FOCUS OF
CURRICULUM REDESIGN
IN THE BLACK COLLEGE*

Henry Allen Bullock

It is with mixed emotions that I accept your kind invitation to serve as a leadership speaker for this Cooperative Academic Workshop sponsored by the Institute for Services to Education.

On the one hand I am much inspired because of the high regard I hold for what it is that you attempt here. The American institution of education has really never been reconstructionist,¹ except for its response to the black and white student movements that were spawned by the mid and late 1960's, and I admire your effort to revive a movement for change that was so begun. Also, I guess, I feel inspired because your invitation caters to some emotional needs that I have. Reaching me about mid-November of last year, your invitation caught me in transition. I had been in retirement since May 31, when I resigned my tenured professorship at the University of Texas at Austin after 41 years of college teaching: 38 years at predominantly black colleges and the last three years at a mainly white one. Since my retirement I have been quietly getting in some recreation before the wheel-chair days set in—sailing the choppy waters of the Gulf of Mexico and hunting the majestic terrain of the Texas hill country as had been my custom during periods of short vacations from work.

But despite this leisure that I now enjoy, I do miss the stimulating contacts with my colleagues and peers, and my chances to touch young lives, once so available, are no longer so abundant. Nevertheless, through your invitation to visit with you now, the void is not nearly so empty, for you give me a chance to make contact, once again, with the fountain-head of black education, and to influence young lives—though only by proxy.

On the other hand, however, I am somewhat depressed. I look with some skepticism upon massive projects to improve the American's social condition, especially projects launched by the government,

*This speech draws heavily upon Henry Allen Bullock, "The Black College and the New Black Awareness," *Daedalus* (Summer 1971) pp. 573-602.

because I sincerely feel that they are designed mainly to serve the cause of the political party in power and never come to grip with the basic faults of American society that bring the problems into existence. We spend millions giving minorities job-training while making no effort at all to correct the conditions that made this training necessary in the first place. We fight drugs at the point of the user while doing nothing to a society that makes escape a necessary remedy for some. Even government researchers and surveyors have shown that such projects as Title I in American education are actually a waste of money, though they say little in criticism of the lack of government interest in those basic conditions that abnormalize the output of an American educational institution and are designed to maintain the status quo of American inequality. This depresses me, and I feel it is only fair that I should let you know this before I claim your attention further.

I do not inject these highly personal matters merely for the pleasure of talking about myself. I do it, instead, for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of continuity in the lives of individuals, institutions, and societies, and to tie this concept into the entire idea of curriculum redesign for the black college. I would not want us to continue to make the mistakes which our own government, supposedly the most civilized in the world, has been wont to make.

If there is any thesis at all in what it is that I say here, it is that the curriculum of the black college is in discontinuity with the black existence; that we need a new kind of curriculum in order that institutional continuity might be established. Several sociological tools are available for the purpose of developing this thesis. The first one is continuity. Man is a developmental organism, not to remain static but to change from infancy to childhood; from childhood to adolescence; from adolescence to adulthood; and from adulthood to old age. These are more than mere biological stages in human development; they are actually roles—parts the society expects the individual to play as he progresses up the biological ladder of human development.

Now these roles are easy for the individual to play if they do not involve "unlearning" roles that are essential for the performance of new roles.² Where requirements for unlearning do not occur, I designate the situation as continuity, and those institutions that cause this kind of balance are said to be in continuity with the social-cultural demands that individual's experience. Discontinuities occur only when aspects of the new role are inconsistent with or contradictory to the old. Institutions that cause this kind of imbalance are said to be in

discontinuity with the social-cultural demands experienced by the individual.

A second conceptual tool that is available is that of social-cultural demands. We should realize that nobody lives free of charge. The environment, ever present as an adversary, offers friction to all organic efforts. But most relevant for our present interest is the fact that the society makes demands upon us all with a force more pressing than that of the physical environment. I say that it is the social-cultural world whose demands constitute the measure of the effectiveness of an institution and determine whether or not it is in continuity with these demands.

A third tool is social institutions. Our institutions, if they have any relevance at all, are established to train people to meet the demands of a society. They, the institutions, are established patterns of behavior from which we have reason to expect some kind of training for social competency that will render the individual adequate for coping with societal demands, and we are justified in requiring that these institutions be continuous.

There is a fourth tool—one that pertains particularly to black people. It is the tool of the black existence. There are instances where group needs are specialized, and the institutions that serve them must be specialized too. Whether we like it or not, the social-cultural needs of black and white Americans are different.³ They are juxtaposed in the minds of those composing each race and emerge as an "either or conception."⁴ There is the common belief that the advancement of one race means the denigration of the other.

Now integrating these tools so as to form a single idea, I come up with the view that the specialized nature of the social-cultural demands placed upon American blacks by the American society requires an educational institution that is different than that in operation now; that our educational institution is in discontinuity with these demands.

Using methods implied by this position, I shall in a very generalized sense delineate the characteristics I believe to be true of American society, describe the black college curriculum that prepares black students for social competency in this kind of society, point up the inadequacy of this kind of curriculum, and present a curriculum that I sincerely feel will meet more adequately the demands.

No matter how you look at it, the basic characteristic of American society is "CLASH." Ours is a democracy that is fractionated by special interest groups and is rendered operative only to the extent that these

different groups find some kind of compromise according to which each can live. Our special interest groups are in constant clash to effect this accommodation, and any group of people that does not recognize this fact is left outside of American democracy—American democracy does not exist for them.

Clash is the basic theme of our society, and there are deep historical roots that attest to this fact. The theme originated out of the work of Charles Darwin and the publication of his Origin of the Species in 1859. You will recall that Darwin framed his famous hypothesis on the assumption that a differentiation of the species is achieved through the biological mechanism of natural selection as it operated in older species. This is the assumption that a new species derives from struggle among the old; that a natural selection for those successful in the struggle results in the subsequent creation of a new organic type that possesses the biological characteristics of the victors.

But this hypothesis was not to remain the exclusive domain of the natural scientist very long. Walter Bagehot, through his Physics and Politics which he published in 1872, picked up the idea and made it applicable as a shaping force of human societies. And social scientists throughout the world straightway began describing social phenomena in terms of struggle, selection, and adjustment.⁵

Before the close of the century, therefore, American sociologists like Benjamin Kidd and William Graham Sumner had planted the idea of Social Darwinism in the minds of American intellectuals and politicians, and the ideology eventually became the alter conscience of the American Protestant Ethic. It reinforced high values placed upon the hard-working and frugal; prompted Sumner to say that social classes owed nothing to each other; and sponsored the Protestant Ethic as a logical explanation for the misery of those who deviated from this spiritual norm. Even before Social Darwinism, its basic idea had become the life-style of the yeoman breed who spawned the slave masters of the American South. Social Darwinism, itself, served as the guiding ideology of an industrial class that began appearing at the close of the 19th century; and, though many Americans rebelled against the unscrupulous practices of these industrialists, installed the concept of rugged individualism that has indeed remained the guiding ideology of our economic system.⁶ More than any other ideology, Social Darwinism has become institutionalized as an American way of life. It is truly the theme of our American culture.

Operating on this kind of traditional theme, our society has ever

been prepared to accept struggle, superiority in struggle, and subsequent adjustment as a self-regulating force. Obviously, all people are not equally prepared for a society of competitive struggle. Therefore, the degree of success became graded according to top, middle, and bottom people. Out of this gradation came our class structure of upper, middle, and lower. It became sociologically significant because it not only arranged the American population according to this hierarchy, but exercised geographical influence in creating upper, middle, and lower class areas within our cities. The insulation created by city freeways made it possible for each class to know little about how the other class lives and generated an insularity that makes each class insensitive to the needs of the other. In short, a complete fractionation of special interest groups based upon class was evolved, thus fractionating a democracy that was meant to be holistic. This is a society of CLASH, and any black who does not recognize this fact is like an ostrich who sticks his head in the sand while leaving a hell of a lot of himself to be picked on.

Even here, however, the implications of this class structure for black colleges is not in the fact of its theoretical existence, but in the fact of its realistic operation.

I really do not decry this theoretical model for American society. Both competition and conflict are inherent in nature, and, when not interfered with, give all people an equal chance to occupy their place even in a society dominated by class and clash. Even Social Darwinism reflects a natural freedom that is compatible with an open society. Social systems, when perceived within the framework of their natural states, are based upon the relations of different forms of organic life. Life in the biotic community exists and functions according to the limits defined only by the innate qualities of organic life. Nature abounds with such examples: the tendency for all living things to survive and live according to their innate abilities to meet nature's demands. Each organism, plant or animal, is allowed to find its niche without giving up its creativity or identity. Darwin, himself, called the functional complex that resulted "the web of life," and Victor Shelford, in his study of the Physical Environment, has shown how really intricate a mere portion of this web can be.⁷

When we leave the biotic world and cross into the super-organic, however, the distinguishing qualities of human societies as opposed to those of plants and animals tend to operate on principles shaped by the collective aspiration of a people. Class, ethnicity, and race enter as factors that shape the opportunities of people, giving some, by this very

fact, advantages that others do not have. The entire process derived from these factors becomes institutionalized into group clash, making the welfare of each dependent upon how well its group can struggle in the competitive arena of Social Darwinism. Of such is the basic nature of American society.

Now I contend that the very character of the black college, even as its curriculum now exists, fails to provide black students with a training that gives them the ability to cope with a society that is fractionated by special interest groups and themed with racism. Only three patterns of curricular design have ever existed within the black college, and neither of these patterns escapes the charge of institutional discontinuity.

Setting the first pattern is the kind of curriculum that originated with these colleges and still characterizes most of them. This is the pattern that neatly constitutes the black college as a purely white college for black students. Several indicators display this white character. If we look at the basic ideology of these colleges and review their guiding philosophy, we are forced to recognize that they were founded and still operate upon several assumptions: the superiority of Western or white values; the educability of black people; and the assimilative nature of American society.

The complete course of study of these colleges, no matter what the major emphasis, was and still is a duplication of curricula provided for white students. The content of its various courses were mere reiterations of courses offered to white students, for most often the teachers were trained at the graduate level in white schools and knew no better than to teach as they had been taught. Running through all such courses was the common thread of the dominant value profile of American culture. The oppositional mode, first and foremost, ran throughout all course content. This is a wide range of oppositional propositions that postulate bigotry in the contrast conception of good and evil.⁸ All of this existed as a firmly embraced value in the black college, while logic dictated that no system of values can encompass genuine contraries outside spurious proportions.

There was also the acceptance of hard work as a specific value-premise. We accepted the idiom "if at first you don't succeed, try, try again." We accepted this literally, unmindful of the block of racism that would never let Afro-Americans fully profit from their full work. Of course there are other values, like those of material well-being or of conformity. Each of these, however, once instilled within the character structure of black youths, led to their self-rejection and not to their

self-emancipation. Such values subtly nourished an anti-black tradition—one that caused black students to hate themselves and to be ashamed of their black heritage.

As late as 1966, Epstein and Komorita showed that the social distance attitudes of Negro children, many reared by parents who graduated from black colleges, were directed toward a fictitious group depicted as having the same characteristics as themselves.⁹ Even one year earlier, Bruce Malver had shown that both Southern and Northern Negro college students held high anti-Negro bias for fear of rejection, indicating that their embarrassment over blackness had rendered them insecure and negative toward their own kind.¹⁰

But this white college for black students did prove the educability of black youngsters. Throughout its long history, it increased school attendance, sparked the rapid movement of black people into the literate state, and spawned a group of black leaders who, by their frustration and ingenuity, did bring effective pressure against the caste-line. It would be superfluous to call this roll of honor, for if you are really black you know every one of them. Also, it would not be historically correct to attribute their aggression to the curriculum of the black college. If we are really fair, we will recognize that these were accidents of the college, by-products and not direct purposes of our intentions.

The assumption of assimilation for which the curriculum of these colleges was established was never justified. However brilliant the output, graduates of the black college, though honored in their own race, were generally rejected by American society. Therefore, we are forced to conclude that black colleges that followed this first pattern—the pattern that professed the superiority of Western culture—were dysfunctional as related to the black existence. Instead of orienting black students toward their own heritage, it pulled them toward the heritage of those who would, throughout time, continue to reject them. This is why I say that black colleges of the first pattern are in discontinuity with the black existence.

Our second curricular pattern tends to characterize the black-white college with the black tail. This is the kind of black college we find today. It is one that apologizes for being black by referring to its students as "predominantly" black while having only one student on its registry that is non-black. It is also the college that tends to concentrate its main efforts upon an assimilation ideal for its students while giving only one or two courses in black history. Because of pressure from its

students and one or two professors who made so much noise that colleges had no other alternative, this kind of college can lay claim to communicating black history to its students while continuing the trend toward turning all of them white. Here, again, no consideration is given to black coping strategy, and the power of black organization is never perceived. Obviously this is dysfunctional for black people who live in a clash world that is themed with racism.

The third pattern is that of the black-white college with a built-in palliative. This is the kind of college that carries a specialized curriculum that was born in response to the rebellion of black students. We find this pattern in white as well as black colleges, and I believe more efficiently organized in the former than in the latter. It offers a major in something it calls "Black Studies," and continues on its way toward the development of a kind of black assimilation that will never happen. The college trend, therefore, never aims at training all its students (especially the blacks) in the virtues and efficiency of their own black groups, but in the illusive expectation of deriving personal power through integral participation in white group affairs. They are not trained for competition with white groups but for participation in them. Black students, through this kind of curriculum, are largely trained in the belief that their welfare is over a fence they cannot cross. This is why, I say once again, that this kind of curriculum is dysfunctional as related to the black existence.

I am proposing here a curriculum that deals consistently with this fractionated society which I have described. It is a curriculum that I define as the "Black Focus" and build it upon specific pedagogical ideals. Ideally, the curriculum would aim to install in every black student a sense of belongingness from whence his identity can only derive. This means that he would be given a sense of awareness of black culture and tradition; provided with a sense of place within this tradition; and provided with a sense of power for being a part of a total folk heritage. I would emphasize that this is a curriculum that aims to give the student group consciousness while generating from this awareness an identity based upon his sense of belongingness. A second ideal is that through symbiotic integration rather than assimilation, the curriculum allows him to function in a white society without losing his own creativity and consciousness of who he is. It would give black students two educations in one—one white; the other black—so that they can use the black as a source of identity and power; use the white as a source of employment and survival. His only real use of white

culture would be that of "selling" it to whites for whom it was intended. In a third sense, when ideally considered, the Black Focus curriculum would join white and black into a mosaic culture that reflects respect for both races. This would be a gigantic enterprise of differentiated cultural unity.

Now let us look at the Black Focus design. Speaking theoretically it is a large circle which I label "Black Focus" orbited by a series of smaller circles which I label according to the basic disciplines usually incorporated in American colleges. These smaller circles, for example, could be labeled anthropology, art, economics, ethics, government, history, psychology, and sociology. The arrows that would be driven from the Black Focus main circle and the orbiting ones would imply that each discipline represented by the latter would be taught from the point of view of the black existence. By teaching each basic fact and principle of each discipline through problems that derive from black people, students could be given a black orientation without sacrificing what they must know about the sum-total of human knowledge. Now you have the basic design of the Black Focus curriculum.

There is much advantage in the learning effectiveness created by this type of curriculum that affords a black student perceptual windows through which he can view the various disciplines through the medium of his own cultural heritage. My experiments have shown, for example, that the reading ability of black students is not an absolute deficiency but a function of the kind of materials on which they are tested. Students who show equal reading ability on items of a standard reading test show higher abilities when tested on reading materials dealing with themselves and their own kind. This has been shown through classical experimental models in which controls were used and significant differences in scores were tested by rather sophisticated statistical designs. Though both groups are equal in reading ability as demonstrated on a standard reading test, experimental groups—those given equated reading materials based upon their ethnic characteristics—will always show scores superior to controls not tested this way. In the end, I guess it is true that we learn best that which is most pertinent to our lives. There is a motivational lesson here I think we should all heed.

Similar results occur with student performance in courses. Students who failed traditional courses in Sociology proved to be equal or superior to those who passed such courses during my last year at Texas Southern University. Using in both instances a group of students

who were about to be dismissed because of poor scholarship, and arranging them into control and experimental groups to whom I taught and did not teach Introductory Sociology through the traditional method, my experimental students who were taught the same course through the Black Focus approach not only surpassed the controls on the average, but virtually knocked the top off a traditional test in this field that was being standardized at the University of Indiana.

The functional style of the Black Focus curriculum has several components. One of these is the universality of its operation. Since it is designed to meet the needs common to all black people, its operation requires that it be made available to all black students of the college. This kind of universality can best be realized through the General Education Program of the college. Although the Black Focus idea does not apply to mathematics and natural science, it could be workable for all the rest of the courses traditionally found in a General Education Program.

The second component of the functional style is that the entire program centers around black culture. This means that a course with some such identification should be installed in the G.E. Program, if it is not there already. This is important, for it is through this course that a student would be exposed to his black roots, including the varied cultures of his African ancestry and the whole question of African transference here in the new world. It is here, too, that he would get the various life-styles of Afro-Americans who compose the various social classes that characterize his every-day life; how these life-styles compare with those of the general society, and how the black as well as white class structures fit into the geography of urban America.

The third component rests with instructional techniques. These techniques do not require a complete abandonment of present methods, but they do call for certain basic changes in our traditional approach. Western values would not be abandoned, but they would be presented objectively in comparison with non-Western values, and particularly with those of black Americans. To illustrate, certain alterations in basic economic concepts would have to be made. The concept of scarcity would have to be viewed as a relative rather than an absolute symbol as related to the American economy, and there would have to be a relative interpretation of price and demand models. Wage curves would lose their absolutivity, and would have to be treated relative to the factor of racism. Even the concept of the American dollar, though perceived during a given time, would have to be

considered within the framework of the racial factor, and the entire question of income would take on a relativity as related to race.

Courses in political science would take on a more sophisticated meaning. They would be taught from the point of view of power and how to get it without money. Such courses would emphasize questions of leadership, party loyalty, and present an analysis of various political strategies as related to minority groups throughout the world. It is here that even revolutionary strategies would be reviewed, not to overthrow our government, but for effecting minority-group power in a CLASH society.

Obviously, I do not have the time or space to detail the total instructional program of a Black Focus curriculum. I hope, nevertheless, that I have done justice to the basic idea: the idea that most established disciplines can be taught to black students through consideration for their black existence; that this new curriculum design tends to free black students from a prison of self-rejection rather than condemn them to a limited world of blackness.

There is this last component of the operational style of the Black Focus design. It pertains to the alternatives for undertaking it and the teachers who would administer it. As to alternatives, there are several. One way is to ignore it altogether, which I suspect most black college presidents will do. A second, more adventuresome in nature, is that a black college can try it out as an experimental college within the larger institution. It can eat its cake and have it too; it can go on its way toward developing "whiteness" while experimenting in a separate college with the development of blackness. Each black college can do this, or, as I hope, one or more black colleges can adopt the Black Focus idea. This would not be revolutionary, since so many of our colleges are on their way toward this end.

Now let us look briefly at the teachers. Only a few of the teachers in black colleges are prepared to teach the Black Focus curriculum. I really should say that only within the younger faculty ranks of these colleges will you find this teaching capability. Such teachers are now being trained—more in white colleges and universities. In the end, however, a faculty with a new outlook will have to be aggregated.

I have tried in these minutes allotted me to do three things: First, to show that we live in a world of struggle—a society of CLASH; second, to evaluate the curriculum of the black college as related to the social-cultural matrix made for black students by this struggle and to find the curriculum of such colleges in discontinuity with the black

existence; and third, to propose a curriculum that is consistent with the nature of this matrix and that would establish, for the first time, continuity in black education.

Although I speak with great confidence and certainty about this Black Focus design, this is greatly a matter of faith. I could be wrong, although I do not think so. Nevertheless, we had better raise some very serious questions about the whole matter. I give these as a starter:

1. Is the black college justified in training black students in the way it now trains them?
2. How would the Black Focus idea serve black students, and how would it operate in a college that desires to have more non-black students?
3. Would this curriculum design inhibit the support that black colleges so badly need?
4. And, to stop here, how well does the Black Focus design serve the aspirations of black people?

Something needs to be done. We are out of step; this is the basic complaint of black students. I think they are right. Also, I hope that I have not kept you too long.

References

1. Nathaniel Hickerson, Education for Alienation (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 1-18.
2. See: Ruth Benedict, "Continuities and Discontinuities in Cultural Conditioning," in Robert W. O'Brian, Clarence C. Schragg, and Walter T. Martin, Readings in General Sociology (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964) 224-228.
3. For illustrations of studies on which this conclusion is based, see: LeRoi Jones, Blues People (New York: William Morrow Company, 1963); Kenneth Clark, Dark Ghetto (New York: Harper and Row, 1965); Elliot Liebow, Tally's Corner (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967); Roger D. Abrahams, Positively Black, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970); David A. Schulz, Coming up Black (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969); and Robert V. Guthrie, Being Black (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1970).
4. See: Vernon J. Dixon and Badi Foster, Beyond Black and White (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971) pp. 25-58.
5. For an elaboration of Social Darwinism and its place in American Sociology, see: Floyd Nelson House, The Development of Sociology (New York:

McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936) Chapter XIV.

6. See: Henry Allen Bullock, A History of Negro Education in the South (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967) p. 119.
7. Victor Shelford, "The Physical Environment," in Murchison, A Handbook of Social Psychology (Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1953) p. 568.
8. For a rather systematic description of Western values, see: Cora DuBois, "The Dominant Value Profile of American Culture," in O'Brien, et al, Op. Cit., pp. 178-183.
9. Ralph Epstein and S. S. Komorita, "Prejudice Among Negro Children as Related to Parental Ethnocentrism and Punitiveness, in Marcel Goldschmid, Black Americans and White Racism (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), pp 33-37.
10. College curricular patterns are based mainly on implied ideology as derived from a variety of Black College catalogs.
11. See: Bruce Maliver, "Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students," in Op. Cit., pp. 48-54.

Discussion

Question: You talked about teachers—and this, I think, is perhaps at the core of some of the problems—you mentioned the fact that basically the younger teacher was, perhaps, more prepared to do this kind of thing. The thing that comes to my mind, we are stuck with the older group, you know, and people like me. So what do you do in this relationship? How do you regroup and so on?

Dr. Bullock: To answer your question bluntly, I resigned.

You raise a vital question, because someone mentioned this morning—I think it was Dr. Blake—that really faculties are handled by older faculty people—that's your curriculum, everything—and the younger ones don't have too much of a chance. I don't know how you can overcome that. I guess by outliving them, and certainly you will do it, but you can't wait that long. But the point that I was trying to make, or to recognize it very well, the point that you have just scored, that colleges now are teaching students to teach this way and, since younger college students have come out of college not long ago, they are more likely to be familiar with this technique than some of the older ones.

Now, if you will let me just briefly mention, very briefly, my work at Texas, this is the kind of thing that we did, and what happened was that practically every social science division—division of humanities,

social science and so forth—began to teach and develop this way, and I could tell not only by our meetings with them and so forth but by the bibliography of their respective courses so that a student—I'll put it this way; I'll bet you that you can get a college graduate from the University of Texas with a baccalaureate degree who is more prepared to teach black students in a black high school—and we have them—than any of the black colleges in that state. Now, that was not because I was there or anything of that sort, but it was because they made a kind of a commitment to them. So the younger ones, I have confidence in them. The older ones I don't think will change too readily. But I must say in behalf of my age group that I do not think that a black teacher older than, say, you are—and you look like a very young person—would be antagonistic toward any kind of change that would enhance the learning power and the sense of self-respect in those whom he has taught so many years. If I believed otherwise, then 41 years of my life have been poured down the drain.

Question: I have a remark that is somewhat related to one question that was raised earlier, and that is to what extent can this approach be used in areas that are not immediately related to race consciousness and so on? I happen to be using a similar approach in a French class with non-majors. The results have been so rewarding that recently a student who is flunking in the course, having been advised to withdraw at midterm, ventured to say that he was not going to withdraw because that was the only course on this campus that would hold his attention and interest for an hour and a half. I am saying this simply because we use not textbooks, but we use sentences that are contributed by the students themselves from their own experience. And once a student has presented such a sentence to the class after presumably having worked on it all night—it takes some of them that long—then the others have the responsibility of asking questions of that student based on what his own words are and which they have not seen before that moment. It turns out that now I have 18 students on my hands who are speaking French in class for an hour and a half twice a week who formerly were demanding that French be abolished from the university.

So I would like to say this in behalf of those areas that related to this program. And as far as older people are concerned, I must say that I have a group of 50 instructors at Southern University who are participating in a program of which I am the director and which is labeled an extension of the college program, and among those 50

people, I think I have pretty close to 15 who would fit in the category of not-so-young, and I have found that under the pressure of campus politics, student awareness and the desire to survive, many of these people are more aware of this than the kids, and they are making progress at a pace which far outstrips the pace of progress being made by some of the younger instructors who, because they feel somewhat insecure in their position at the university and because, perhaps, of their inexperience in the field of teaching, would not be ready yet to take a look from a different perspective, or as those older persons, under the pressure of survival and the need for survival, especially the need for survival, feel that they can do so.

So I would not discount anyone whose hair is gray, white or who has no hair at all.

Dr. Bullock: Well, I certainly appreciate the response to that, and I certainly appreciate it as another illustration of the effectiveness or the possible effectiveness of this kind of method. I believe in it so much that I would almost bet my life that you try it for a semester and those students you thought were so dumb will become extremely brilliant. It's a very, very good way of reaching the students' attention.

I'll say this and then I'll quit on that, and that is that we've been talking about remedial, okay, and that he's behind. The only question I raise is, remedy in what and what is he behind in and that if you actually expose the student to the basic disciplines through the medium of his own heritage and that with which he is most familiar, you will tap abilities not yet seen. And I don't think it's right to say he's retarded unless we say he's retarded in what. And I think your statement certainly verifies that.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN BLACK COLLEGES

Herman R. Branson

Thank you, Dr. Woolfolk. I must say in all my years that's about as little introduction as I've had. But I do appreciate it, for I want every minute we can have together tonight.

I talked to some of our distinguished members and I don't think that you received the reprint of my talk. There were certain things I said that I would like just to refer to, and maybe we should go through and hit those high points and return to the explications as we go along.

To begin with, my talk is "New Directions in Black Colleges." To understand that, we must attempt to look at the society of which we are a part, and that is where our troubles begin.

Well, what should we be doing in the black college in 1972? And in a certain sense this is a prophetic year, a watershed year, because if you think for a moment the freshmen who came to us last fall, in the fall of '71, will graduate in May-June of 1975. Assuming that a college graduate works roughly 50 years after he finishes college, this is the first class in our history which will spend half of its working time in this century and half of its working time in the next century. So you and I really have a fantastic responsibility to insure somehow that these young people will have the intellectual skills, the social skills, the salable skills so that they can live, function and contribute to a demanding, exasperating, technological civilization. The black colleges are not exempt from this responsibility. As a matter of fact we probably hold it a little more carefully than any other college in America. And so when we plan our programs and think of new directions, we must think in terms of what are going to be the demands of the 21st century. Think of that. These young people whom you will go back to see next week, young men, young women, roughly 25 years or 30 years from now the boys will be in their prime, in their mid-forties, the girls will be in their late twenties, and it's just awe inspiring to think that they will be the ones who must be controlling, directing and understanding this complex world of which we are a part.

It is with that background, then, that I think we should at least assess our present programs and plan for what the programs should be. And from the way in which I talked, I think you know that I'm not

pleased with the way the programs now are. I don't think we should ever be pleased, but much more importantly I am really distressed by some of the recent developments, developments which have been pushed upon us but developments which perhaps we have embraced a little avidly ourselves.

Whatever may be the demands of the 21st century, one thing is certain: it's going to require people of integrity, of tough mental fiber who understand the nature of man and this small little piece of dirt of which we are a part, the earth. If they do not understand that, if they cannot really contribute, then they are going to be really superfluous individuals. The good thing about our society is that everybody does not have to be doing something really important, thank God. It is what we call, you know, or in language theory, in coding, it's what you call redundancy. That is, every letter, every word does not have to be absolutely right for you to get the meaning. Because if that were true, you know, no human society could function because there is always somebody goofing off.

I mean there's always somebody not functioning properly, and so consequently in a society you have to know just how many people you can allow to be goofing off before this society disintegrates. In America if we aren't careful it is going to be so organized that all blacks are going to be doing only things which are unimportant and insignificant as society goes forward. That is what we are programmed for at the present time, and that is what distresses me. I hope it distresses you. That's what I'd like to talk about in this 30 or 40 minutes I shall take with you.

Now, what do I mean by that: Let's look around us. At the present time there is a great movement; people are worried about the number of people who are going into graduate study. It's a tragic step backward, what is happening. I just learned a couple of weeks ago at a meeting down there in the National Research Council that next year Harvard University, which normally takes about 850 new graduate students, will take only about 400 new graduate students this coming fall. It's going to cut its graduate enrollment in half. And people are lamenting the fact that there is no need for this high intelligence. Of course I think that's all absolutely wrong; but when we are looking at us, when we look at blacks we are somewhat like being way up at the end of the bay, and before the high tide gets to us it's already going back out.

There is no profession in America, there is absolutely no field in

America, where there are too many blacks. The only place where there are too many of us are in prisons. That's the only place I know. But even in teaching, for example, which you might think—we really don't represent any more than 6 percent, maybe 7, but we certainly aren't the 12 percent we ought to be based on the population ratio. In medicine, you know what the figures are. In spite of the fantastic job which Howard and Meharry have been doing, still of the more than 300,000 physicians in the United States, only 5 or 6,000 are black. How many should be black? The number should be nearer 30 or 40,000. So consequently right now we have a deficit in physicians alone, and when you go into other fields, engineers, it's worse. Any field you name where the people are contributing to society in the manner in which society must be supported, we are not there and we are not even being prepared to go there. And that, I think, is the major tragedy of what we are looking at.

Elias Blake mentioned this morning these figures about the number of our people now who are in higher education, and you get all sorts of conflicting results. Let's accept it—let's say that there are half a million blacks in higher education this year. The number, you know, should be nearer a million. So already, right there, we have only half the number we should have. But what are they doing? What are they doing? If you are not very careful, you are going to find that we are going to have the majors in basket weaving, recreation—that's what we're going to get. They're going to be the ones in communication. I thought English was good enough, you know, but now there are majors in communications and things like this. Why do other people get Ph.D.'s in English and we have to get it in communications? I don't quite understand that. It just doesn't quite make sense to me.

And so the first thing I shall ask for us to think of in the black colleges is to think in terms of our young people really getting the basic understandings so that they can move into the truly germinal, fundamental fields.

Now, that is a big assignment. It was what really motivated many of us when we thought of the Thirteen College Project in the first instance. We were distressed over what was happening to our young people in all levels. The great tragedy of 1972 is that if you look very closely at what's going on now in the big cities that they are making very little attempt to do anything for the young blacks who are there. I just looked at some data. We at Lincoln have been getting students who normally finish in the upper one-fifth or two-fifths of a graduating

class, and we are still getting them. But when we looked at their SAT scores, we found that over the last six years they are still in the upper part of their graduating classes, but as far as English and mathematics are concerned, they are going right down here (indicating). If it keeps on like this, I think I extrapolated, in about 15 years from now they will be still graduating high in their classes and they won't even be able to speak to each other because they're not speaking English. This is what's happening right now, and this is our concern.

Can you and I do anything about this, and can we look at the programs and can we look at the world and get a feeling of what's going on in the world and just see what is happening? Of course my answer is I think we can.

I think, for example, that we must be very careful that whatever we do must be intellectually honest. We must be very careful that, "I understand what the plight of the black man has been; oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, we know the suffering he has experienced." But that should not lead us into substituting new myths for old myths. That, I think, is the fundamental danger. For race itself is the most pernicious myth that man has ever invented. He invented it for very good reasons. He found it was a nice, easy way to have other people fighting each other if he could sort of draw a line between groups of people.

But let us look at the world in 1972 and see just what credence can we give to any idea that because your skin happens to be a little different from someone else's you are fundamentally different from that person. All the evidence, now, the scientific evidence from comparative biochemistry, social anthropology, all these areas, is that the physiognomic differences among men are superficial, that men, no matter where they are found on the surface of this earth, they are the same animal. And that shouldn't really startle us. I mean you walk through the street and you see a little white dog and a little black dog having a wonderful time together, having little black-and-white puppies. It's not at all unusual, a big dog, little dog, and so on. This should not startle us. But somehow or other we have accepted this myth; and yet if we look at men we find this to be true, and yet if we look at this or we think of men and what they are like, that that gene pool which used to swing backwards and forth across Asia and Europe, every now and then some of us would run up from Africa and leave a few and run back, you know, and that is the gene pool which has really predominated the Western world.

But if we look at a little interesting phenomenon, that is the fact

that some people were cut off, the people in Australia were cut off from this European-Asiatic gene pool for roughly about 25,000 years. They got down there, you remember, and geologic things changed and then you couldn't get backwards and forth, and they were different people. But they were still people. Just 200 years ago the British went in there, remember, and they found them, different people, yes, but their molecules were precisely the same. They and the British bred together, you remember, with great enthusiasm and the offsprings are wonderfully brown people whom you see. And I think one of the nicest things that ever happened was when Miss Evonne Goolagong last June won the Wimbledon tennis championship. Here's a young woman, an offspring of an English-Australian Aborigine cross, a wonderfully coordinated young lady, all the skills you could think about, all the fine characteristics, no handicaps whatsoever.

Men are the same wherever they are found. And that we cannot get away from, and that we don't want our students, if we are honest with ourselves and with them, believing anything else about man is a disservice.

Now, man as a social being becomes something else because then he is conditioned by the type of social system in which he has been reared, and in the social system in which he has been reared he will have experienced, because he is a black, certain things, but that does not mean that as far as man total in 1972 is concerned, the idea remains an anachronism. We got over it; we no longer need it. We don't have to use it in order to justify our exploiting of other people any more. We don't have to have it. We know now we are exploiting them and we know now we are using this thing in order to justify exploitation. And so, consequently, sure, black is beautiful. It certainly is. But every other color that human beings can have is also beautiful, and every human being, no matter where he is on the surface of this earth, is a dignified creature equally patterned by God, if anybody ever was patterned by God on the surface of the earth.

The second thing which we must consider in 1972 are the prospects for this world of which you and I are a part. I think we all know the apocalyptic pessimism which really permeates so many people we meet. Our young people especially feel as though the world is going to pot, and they just don't see the—you know, the ancient verities have been renounced. Heaven knows what's going on is enough to frighten even the most sanguine among us, because you know what happened last summer in India, Bangladesh, you saw it in the many

pictures; people who were obviously exactly the same in basic genetic structure, the same skin color, the same type of hair and all, found really adequate superficial reasons for clubbing each other to death, sticking bayonets into each other. You know even today as we talk a million and a half people up in Northern Ireland, half a million Catholics, a million Protestants are finding all sorts of reasons to be bombing and killing each other. Truly the civilized precepts are very thin things in the world of which we are a part. But that doesn't really justify our not believing that programs are possible for man. If anything Apollo did on Sunday, I hope it will again re-emphasize for us that we are together on this little isolated bit of dirt; that's all we have. You don't expect any help to come from anywhere else. It is our job to find the ways and means of bringing the advantages of civilization to all the peoples on this earth, and it can only come from those of us who have the opportunity to understand.

The most alarming statistics and the one which I referred to in my abstract here, the one which makes what we are doing now in the predominantly black colleges in America, what you are doing, much more important than something for a few blacks in America. For it is our assignment, and how in the world can we take 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 year olds of indifferent intellectual background who have suffered cultural and social deprivation, whose motivation is faulty, sometimes pernicious; he's dying to go to medical school so he can have a big car and run around with little women and spend man-sized money. Now, this is what he is thinking about, you see. This is now—what can we do with young people like that? What can we do? That's our assignment. But it's a small assignment in America, but it does embrace, even in America, 22 million of us blacks. It involves 10 and a half million Spanish speaking Americans and roughly a million and a half million Indians. But they are not participating either as they should, and we must find ways and means for them.

But outside America it is the overwhelming problem of the world, because outside America, ignorance is really going forward much more rapidly than learnedness.

I never tire of giving this statistic, because I think it's one which you ought to wake up in the morning and cringe about. In 1960, according to the UNESCO Reports, there were 740 million illiterate adults in the world—740 million. Roughly half the adults of the world were illiterate. In 1970, ten years later, there were 800 million illiterate adults in the world. In that 10-year period, we had gained 60 million

illiterate adults, many more than the number of college graduates gained in that same decade.

So what we are really looking at is a race between education and disaster, for you cannot really conserve the world if so many of the inhabitants who must understand and therefore use it wisely, really do not have the equipment to do that.

So with that background, then, let's turn more specifically to what you and I can do. And I don't want to talk too much in the large; I want to come up with some real specific things, and I'm going to end up with—maybe I'll start off with that. The problem, as some of us conceive it, then, is we can't possibly take this youngster and then take him back through the same 18 years of conditioning that, say, an advantaged youngster in our society has experienced. You can't do that. There are two reasons for it. Number one, you don't have enough time; he would end up then 38 years of age and, you know, good for nothing.

Number two, human beings are not like that. He has already gained a whole gamut of habits, values, attitudes, judgments which you can't eradicate. What we can do, we don't know. We have some really nice little things to give us hope.

Let me mention three that I like very much. I'll mention two blacks—No, I'll mention three blacks. One of the blacks I mentioned was Martin Robeson Delaney. I don't know whether you know Dr. Harold Delaney; he happens to be, I think, a grandson of Martin Robeson. Martin was born up in what is now Charleston, West Virginia in the early 1800's. His family was poor. This, of course, was before the Civil War. There was a family, I think, of six or so children. They were bright, but they were illiterate. In those days there were itinerant book dealers who walked around selling books, and since there were not too many people who could read, the idea was if you bought this set of books they would teach you how to read—that must be a commentary on modern education. Well, it became known that there was a family of blacks in Charleston who were reading, and in the early 1800's this was not a social virtue looked upon with a great deal of applause, you know, by the people there. So Martin's family found it congenial to move from Virginia up into Pennsylvania, and they did. But around 1848 we find the same Martin Robeson Delaney who had that inauspicious beginning at the Harvard Medical School, and then we follow his career as a physician. He went to Europe; Queen Victoria made him a major; he came back, he played a very fine role in the Civil

War, he was with Wade Hampton down in South Carolina. He ended out at Wilberforce, died there in 1892. When I was out there, I checked on his death record. I couldn't find where he was buried. I did so want to go by and pay my respects.

Here was a black who out of the worst circumstances achieved what even then was a career which demanded training, college work—Martin Robeson Delaney.

But Martin is interesting from another aspect. He is given credit for being the first great black nationalist. Frederick Douglass used to say, "I praise God every day that he made me a man and not a slave, to stand up and talk back," he said, "but Martin praises him every morning that he made him a black man."

Then there's another one whom I like, a man by the name of George Washington Henderson. You never heard of him; he's less well known. But when the Civil War ended, Henderson was 14 years old and completely illiterate. Eleven years later he was graduating valedictorian of his class from the University of Vermont, the first black in history, I think, who was elected a member of Phi Beta Kappa. So here is someone who has had all this unfortunate background but who, in favorable soil, went ahead to develop and to produce in this fashion.

But there is another little black man. He's an Indian, a real Indian, from the subcontinent of Asia. His name was Ramanujan, and he is one of the great examples of a person who had very little formal training but who, even late in life, had an opportunity and went ahead to do unusually significant things intellectually. Ramanujan flunked even the very weak examination given for Indian universities. He was working in the post office. He found a relatively second rate book on higher mathematics, he studied it, ended up knowing a great deal about it, and then he did some things on his own. At that time in England, the most distinguished mathematician was a man by the name of Hardy, G. H. Hardy of Cambridge. And I remember Hardy saying that he got this letter which had about 15 or 16 mathematical results in it. And Hardy said when he looked at it, "Well, obviously I know more about this than anybody in the world"—Hardy was a modest man. So he looked at these and he gasped, "Look—my goodness gracious," he said, "this must be either an unusually competent mathematician or the biggest crook I've ever run into." But then he said, "No, you can't be a big crook and write down good mathematics; you must be a good mathematician even if you are a crook." So his conclusion was this guy must be an unusual mathematician.

So immediately he set things to find out about Ramanujan. He found out what he was doing in India; he brought him to England, he was made a Fellow of the Royal Society, and worked at Cambridge. He published some very brilliant papers on number theory, so-called, and Hardy never ceased to marvel at this guy. What was it like—how could this little fellow you know, he already had consumption, tuberculosis, before he came to England; what was it about him? I mean why, of all the people on the earth, did this particular talent fall on a little black guy down in south India? This is what Hardy was thinking to himself.

Hardy told the story—which I think is a good one—that Ramanujan was ill. He was an orthodox Hindu; he insisted upon cooking his own food; he stayed in his own little apartment while he was ill, so Hardy decided to go to see him. England is often wet, you know, so he got a taxi. Hardy got there; he didn't know what to talk about. He said, "I took a taxi over." He said, "License number 1729, a very uninteresting number." Ramanujan said, "Oh, no, that's a very interesting number." Hardy said, "You don't say?" He said, "Oh, yes; yes, that number." He said, "That number is the sum of two different cubes in two different ways." And Hardy says, "Glory be." And it is. Look at it; it's 12 cubed plus 1 cubed, and it's 10 cubed plus 9 cubed. And Hardy said, "Well, how in the world do you—what do you do? I mean, how do you feel? How do you get things like that?" And Ramanujan said, "I just looked at it. Don't you see things like that, too?"

Now, what I give you are examples of people who, in spite of no aid before, really went ahead. But that's why—there are only a few of them. You and I must be concerned about that great mass of human beings who need all the aid that they can possibly get. Remember, when the Civil War ended in 1865, there were 400,000 free blacks in the United States and only 28 of them had been to college. And so consequently you can see what the problem is. You and I must think of the average youngster who comes to us and what we can do for him.

Let us turn, now, more specifically, to programs. And to be sure, I would like to talk to you for a week on this. I've got a whole lot of notes, but I will restrain myself and let's get on programs.

So what could we think about new directions in black colleges in terms of programs which will take these young people we're talking about from Philadelphia, from Washington, from New York, who are going to come to us now with only the vaguest notion of what the intellectual life is about and who are going to come to us with the most

apalling disarray of habits and attitudes. What can we do?

I think right away, then, you can see why it is so necessary for the predominantly black colleges to think in terms of having an active group in the basics, anyway. I mean by that mathematics, language, science, social science. What are the things which I think are essential, and how can I capsule them in such a fashion and how can I present them to these young people who are coming—see them walking across the campus, there? How can I do it so that we can overcome all the years of neglect and yet they will end up with true intellectual muscle so that they can handle the ideas and the concepts which are necessary for the modern world?

Essentially this was what we were attempting to answer in the Thirteen College experiment. That's essentially the same type of question that was raised, for obviously we just couldn't go back again and do everything over again. But could we take them there and sort of move them up and so that all the things that they had missed somehow, by putting them on a higher peak, they could look over them and not need them. They need not have come over each and every valley but where, by raising them here, they can look back and see what the terrain is like without having experienced each and every valley. That is still the difficulty.

Perhaps there is an answer to that, but some of us are still sufficiently impressed by it that we are going to have a meeting up in Cambridge; Jerrold Zacharias and I are going to call one the first of next month where we're going to get some more people together to start asking the same questions: What can I do in mathematics? Really, can you do anything in mathematics? One of the very discouraging things about reading Piaget, you know, is the feeling you get that if certain things are not done at certain stages, you are going to have a heck of a time trying to get them done at a later stage. I used to feel that way. The people in my family when I was growing up, my grandmother's sister, she was a younger great aunt, but she never learned fractions in the fifth grade, and I remember I was in about the sixth or seventh grade at the time and she said, "Could you sort of help me learn fractions?" She said, "I never learned them in the fifth grade," and, really, I was appalled by this. This feeling that here's an adult who did not have that particular mastery.

Well, there is a story from my elementary physics at Howard that after the first class in physics there the teacher came out and was walking down the steps and he ran into one of his students and said,

"How are you getting along?" He said, "Do you understand those sines and cosines and tangents we're talking about?" And the young man said, "Oh, yes, yes." He said, "I'm not having any trouble with those sines, cosines and tangents," he said, "but those halves and thirds are giving me hell." And this is a real issue; this is a real issue. And if we can do nothing more in our schools than go back and really make sure that what we are not doing is putting a superficial coat of paint on a weak surface and go back and see if we can't do something about that underpainting so that the people end up really mastering the basic subjects.

The tragedy—Oh, I don't know; there are certain things that you feel so keenly that you think you know how to do and do right. But let me tell you a brief history of something in the Thirteen College Experiment which many of you don't know. This was worrying some of us deeply, and so in the second year program we thought that one way of doing this might be to put in the second year this, really, what has now become a philosophy course, but it really wasn't going to be a philosophy course as originally conceived. It was going to be a course on how and why and when do you believe something. In brief, what type of evidence do you need in order to believe?

We thought that by going about it like this we might be able to build up in a group of young people some principles of criticism, some principles of analysis which would enable them to go in and look at something and, really, without knowing very much about it, really say, "Now, wait a minute. What is he talking about?" And then enable them to dissect the argument down once more and get a feeling that, "Look, does this or doesn't it make sense? Is the evidence too slim to support the conclusions which are being presented to us?" That, I thought, was going to be a very fascinating thing. I was all eager, and I had some things drawn up, but it didn't go out like that. Maybe that's something we can try later on. But the idea was—it's just like in physics; in physics, you know, you could spend all of your time and you could get, really, not through Isaac Newton's work for the very simple reason that there's a deep thought and deep physics which you can find there. Then you can decide, really, that you don't need a lot of that; you can come over here and learn certain things and then look back, and all of that falls into perspective without your knowing all of the details about it. Is that true in other fields? If it is true in other fields, is that not the new direction which we should be taking? In our fundamental courses ask ourselves, "What are the real core things? What are the essentials?" And

believe me, they're going to change. You yourself will think differently about them year after year. But nevertheless, if you go about it that way, you will have a method which will be fundamentally self-correcting, and each year, then, you can go in with increasing enthusiasm and an increased sense of really fitness for doing the task which is before you, because, heaven knows, we can't teach everything; then, that the new direction ought to be that we don't try. We get away from—and this is something that you and I have been paying lip service to, but I must tell you, I must tell you tragically that in my visiting most of our schools recently—and I won't tell you the ones which I visited—still we are in too much the textbook-assignment mode. You get one textbook and you make an assignment and you ask them to read, and you come back in and you regurgitate. That's what we used to call the smallpox theory of learning. You know, you have the disease, but you wanted it to leave you with as few marks on you as you possibly can—I mean get out of it this way.

So we don't want it that way. Our young people don't need that. Our young people need something so that they end up where they really have done some problem solving, where they really have gotten into the thing. And because what you're really trying to do—what you're trying to do, you're trying to prime them, you must remember, for the 21st century. You really are trying to convince them that by going about it this way, working at it in this fashion, you will have the foundation which you can really move your life forward doing these things.

So, in sort of summary, in re-analysis, then, you and I have a major job. Our enemies don't want us to be doing anything important. They are eager for us to assume the ancillary and the superficial. They are dying to give us the degrees in general studies and things like that. They are eager for us to take them; oh, they can hardly wait.

There is one group in history which, perhaps, we might look at because tragically, as far as I know, there has only been one group in history which has persisted historically in maintaining its culture and ending up now in 1972 with an ancient culture—slightly mythologized, of course—and those, of course, are our friends, the Jews. But observe, they did not let their Jewishness interfere with the facts, and they are studying psychology, sociology and mathematics and chemistry and physics and English; they aren't doing everything in Jewish studies. They're not. They're in the English department at Harvard University. They are head of the physics department at the University of

Pennsylvania. They're head of the mathematics department at schools such as Duke. That's where they are. They "ain't" over there talking about how Jewish they are and how wonderful they are by virtue of that. No, they know better than that. They're not in that. They are learning economics. They are learning about the international market. So when society needs somebody, it can call them in, and you look around and I've heard it said, "My God, there's nobody out there but them who knows anything about this." That's where we must be. We must have our young people with the skills where they are doing the essential things in our society, not sitting on the borderline someplace, not parading up and down, you know. We've had enough of that. History is full of that. People march right out to oblivion when they do things like that. But if they want to stay within the mainstream, they must have the skills to do the real things that the society needs, and our society needs people with sharp minds and warm hearts, with integrity, habits of thought, values, judgment, ability to work and to turn their hands and minds to the real tasks of our society. That's where we are lacking right now, ladies and gentlemen, and that ought to be the new direction for our schools. Now, we are going to get every type of discouragement we can possibly get. You know what the developments are. Whenever a predominantly black school attempts to develop a really significant program, somebody comes in—well, you know the story. Morgan State College there in Baltimore, tightly woven into an urban community; they applied to a major foundation to work an urban studies program. They didn't get it. There's a little school over there with half the number of students as Morgan, but a prestigious school, called Johns Hopkins, and they got it. I think we can mention this now, Elias. The president of Morgan was infuriated over this. He said, "What do you mean? We are the people. We are the ones who are in this city. We are the ones who are working here, and you give an urban studies program to somebody over there." And, of course, I'm glad to say the foundation relented and gave them some money. But this has been the pattern; this has been the pattern. They want us to have nothing significant. And you and I are to blame. You and I have not had guts enough up until recently to say anything about what's going on.

I think this new medical bill which just went through, this omnibus bill in which they plan to make up six new medical schools. Where were you? Why didn't some of us say, "Look, the need is so great among minority peoples; if you're going to form six new medical

schools, adding already to 102, then every one of those six ought to be under minority auspices and minority control in order for minorities to get through." Did you say anything like that? Did anybody else say anything like that?

But this is the type of thing we must do. We must call attention at every step along the way that if you're sincere about making educational opportunity a reality in America, then you must move to do it. You must stop talking about it; you must stop obfuscating the issue; you must stop making trivia of the things we are trying to do. And that's what we're getting over and over again.

So I'm delighted that you are thinking about what we should be doing. It's not going to be easy, for, you know, even as we talk tonight our enemies are well heeled—oh, they are clever. Even as you and I plan, they are out there planning, too, to make certain that as we move, there will be counter moves which will weaken us, making it less and less possible for us to go ahead.

But, quite specifically in your own schools you can insure that the young people who come to you, that they do get these opportunities for the fundamentals, and it's not difficult, really, it's not difficult. I think that this wonderful program, the one of the Thirteen College Experiment—sure, you can do it because, remember, work is only onerous when it's uninteresting. If it's interesting, it's not work. You do it; you spend long hours at it. Why? Because it's significant. It's relevant for you. And this is what we must do. We must somehow try to get our young people together to see how it does fit that pattern, why, and—all right, you're interested in black studies. Okay, you're interested in black studies. Wonderful. There's no need, there is no area in the world where there is a greater need of expertise. You're interested in black studies. Okay, we're going to give you the background. In order to do anything relevant with black studies, particularly in Africa, there are about six languages you ought to at least have, let's say, an everyday acquaintance with. Obviously, it's Coptic, Ancient Egyptian, Aramaic, Arabic, French, Portuguese, German and a little English. Are you ready for that? No. No, they want to talk from third-rate sources, tertiary and quaternary sources.

And yet, it's the thing that's the most fascinating area in the world. Africa has hardly been touched. It's whole pre-history is there, and scholars are desperately needed. All right, so if you want to do this, this is what you need to do. But you can't do it on the foundation which you are rearing for yourself with your mouth. If I'm ready to

quote myself, and I don't normally use four-letter words, and I think all of you are adults, but I was moved in Texas a few days ago to make a remark that no nation in history has reared itself up on a pile of bull manure. And that's what we must be careful about. That's what we must be careful about.

I apologize for that, but I started to say it was ap^{is} effluvia. I thought I might be misunderstood, you know. Apis was the sacred bull of Egypt.

But that's true. That's it. And when our young people are not working hard; when our young people are not using their talents fully, then we are misleading them. They are not being prepared for the competitive world of the 21st century, because you go and you watch those Chinese school boys in Hong Kong; you watch those Jewish kids in Israel, and they are not spending their time on trivia. They are learning—they are learning the things which run this world. They are learning the languages, the social science, the science, the engineering. This is what the world goes on.

You see, we could have been talking to each other in flowing terms for the next 400 years and nothing would have happened. It's only when we came to grips with the physical universe and know something now about how things are put together that we made a difference in our lives, and that's how the world is still going.

As an exercise I did something which I thought you might be interested in. The area in which you and I catch most of our flak is, of course, the realization that we have brought forth in the modern world an educational system, a culture, which is strongly influenced by the verbal, conceptual type of education, centered around language and language ability.

We had a big snowstorm up in Oxford, Pennsylvania a little while ago, and I was marooned at the Oxford Hotel. Those of you who know the Oxford Hotel, they gave me the bridal suite—I mean me, just me alone. I read several books while I was there, and in reading those books, I ran across something which, really perhaps if we could get our young people just looking at language that way—you know, you read it and it sounds so good. So, what I did was a little game. I made three columns, one, two, three, and I could find certain words which would go in column one and in column two and in column three. And then, you can give me any three-digit number—give me a three-digit number, your favorite.

A Voice: 123.

Dr. Branson: 123. That's a great deal of imagination, I will say. So, if we take 123, for example, and go to this particular setup, with 123, "potentially evaluation materials." Now, you see, you're reading along and someone says, "Of course, in designing this educational experience you must be certain that you have potentially evaluation materials."

Well, anyway, that's a lot of foolishness, but it sounds so good. It sounds so good.

Give me another one.

A Voice: 486.

Dr. Branson: 486. Okay, that's better. 486 is "dramatic audiovisual programming." Ah, that's good. "Dramatic audiovisual programming." And of course, now, at Norfolk State we would never think of bringing in a program in any course in our curriculum without making certain that it has dramatic audiovisual programming.

And this is what we are getting. We are really getting our human values submerged in words. And what we must learn how to do is to enable our young people to cut it away, to cut it away.

A Voice: Try 764.

Dr. Branson: 764 is "conventional, enriched increase." Okay, let's use that one. Okay. "Now, of course, in physics you must make certain that as you move from concept to concept that you do not just achieve a conventional, enriched increase. You must seek for something more."

But I think the point is well chosen. So we really have a great assignment, friends; it's dramatic, it's significant, and, probably, as I said earlier, the most important assignment anywhere in the world. For if you and I can find how to do that in America, then it's exportable. Then we can carry it to other peoples, and they, then, can find the ways and means of taking these young people and enabling them in a reasonable period of time to gain the intellectual skills, the social skills and, above all, the humanistic orientation which they so desperately need for this demanding world of the 21st century.

It isn't going to be easy. We have allies. And we hope that our strongest ally may very well be the enlightened self-interest of the people we now have who realize that it's better, perhaps, to give a little than it is to—well, engage in mayhem, murder, although they are doing that.

So, I'm delighted to be among you. You're going to hear, I hope, something more about this new program which we are going to get

underway. At least we will start talking about it in May. But you have the ingredients. By your being here you have the ingredients. The ingredients say, "Go back and individualize your curriculum and individualize your instruction." Treat each one of these young people who come to you as precious, as, above all, educable, and then try to find ways and means of insuring that they really do get the understanding.

If that we do, we can never worry about the outcome of what we have. If that we don't do, then I think we should be eternally ashamed of our failure in this regard.

Gee, I'd like to talk some more. But finally, let us take 963. Now, 963 says, "Relevant, effective principles." If there are any "relevant effective principles" which we can call for—and that's a good one, by the way—then I think they are your dedication, your understanding, your concern.

The problem is a big one; it's fascinating, demanding, and I think we are going to do something about it.

Discussion.

Dr. Branson: But my point was that they don't spend their time emphasizing their Jewishness. The point I was making was, you find them as professors of mathematics, as professors of chemistry, professors of sociology, professors of English. And the point I was making was that they have not spent their time contemplating their navels, which might be pretty and easy to look at, but they have spent their time contemplating and using the world.

In brief, I think that there is a way in which we can incorporate our blackness as a strong, motivating factor without making it a set of blinkers to limit the way in which we function in the modern world. That was my point. I will agree with you wholeheartedly.

Yet I will also say this, that I would hope that we can learn and can truncate some of the—we don't have to go through every step that they went through. We can learn a great deal, and we hope that we can cut—you see, because the real—gee, the point which I have taken, maybe I didn't emphasize it enough, but the point which I hope I was emphasizing is that in 1972 it is a different ballgame. It's a different ballgame in man's understanding of himself and the nature of the physical world. Up until now you could say that we were in a world of

shortages; there wasn't enough. People were doomed to hunger and starvation and privation. That's no longer true. With the discovery of nuclear energy we can say honestly that man, for the first time in his history has the material resources to bring the advantages of civilization to everybody on this earth. And that doesn't mean that man can keep on breeding himself out of existence. He can do it recreationally without being productive.

This, I think, is what we have to look at. But we are there. And for the first time, this is true, and yet, practically all of man's history has been predicated upon the fact that there were shortages. Therefore, this little group of people had to find some reason for gaining their cohesiveness so they could battle another group of people and take certain materials away from them, take their land or take their cattle—you know, move them away so they—but that's no longer necessary, no longer necessary for man. You see, it's no longer necessary for you—you know, you don't have to put a sandwich in your pocket now and take it up to your room. You don't have to do that. There will be meals down here later on, you know. This is the type of thing; we don't have to do that.

And so man's whole attitude, I think—and that's the point I think we should make, that the world has really changed radically in the last 35 or 40 years.

Question: Do you see any incompatibility between what you said tonight and what Dr. Bullock said?

Dr. Branson: Well, yes. Yes. But I think that Dr. Bullock was talking more about using blackness as a motivating factor, and I will agree with him. It seems to me that when you look at the world, you must think in terms of young people must do in order to really live and contribute to that world. I think he would have a narrower perspective than I have, which is quite all right. I'm sure that if Dr. Bullock and I were together for a long while that we might not agree on a whole lot of things. But that's all right. That's all right.

Comment: Is it really incompatible, if we look at the TCCP Program, because I really think that Dr. Bullock's presentation was in the ball park of what you started out to try to do in the TCCP Program in terms of the materials that you used.

You see, I think that we have to recognize that within our black colleges there are two things that we have got to do. One is the social development of our youngsters, and the other thing is tool them up so that they can compete. And Dr. Bullock's point of view, to me, was this

business of their social development, you see, because if we don't recognize the need of our students in terms of their personality development, in terms of the environment from whence they come, because this has got to be taken into consideration as we try to instruct them.

Dr. Branson: You can't instruct them otherwise. The two things, I think, that we learned in the Thirteen College Experiment was that no matter what you talked about there must be this ego reinforcement. It had to come. They had to feel as though they were important, they were treated as important beings and they were doing things which were significant. And the second was that they had to end up with an acceptable self image. They had to feel again as though, "Look, I can do—this is me, and I'm dealing with people who respect me and want me to do something and are on my side." I would agree wholeheartedly with that.

Comment: It's a tricky situation. You see, we don't want to admit that our colleges might have to become an institution that trains kids to combat racism. See, in all the stuff you went through, which I thought was beautifully done—you did not—you sort of committed the sin of benign neglect of racism in black colleges. See, you mentioned—Delaney, and your anecdotes were beautiful, but they were fortified, and even if we let you go longer, you still would be talking about a few chaps out of millions of black people. These are chaps who, despite the whole stream of racism, how thin it is, you know—

Dr. Branson: You didn't hear my original quote, then, did you?

Comment: Yes, I followed you very closely. But you never accepted the obligation for the black colleges of preparing the youngster to come to grips with the discrimination he's going to meet when he finishes college. Now, we cannot deny that discrimination exists, so the whole question is, to me, should a college do that? Now, I think it should.

Dr. Branson: Well, I hate to give the speech over, and I won't. The point which I was making is that there is something more important than racism, and that is, making sure that the young people who come to us, that we work with them so that they will gain the things that we are talking about. In doing that, they will understand racism, why it has evolved in this society, what it has meant, how it has been used. That, I think, is much more important than the other things we are talking about.

Now, if they really have the skills we were talking about, the

essential skills, so that they can move and function in society, then they can combat racism. But if they don't have those skills, the only thing that they have against the Sherman tanks of racism will be M1 rifles against Sherman tanks. But what we want to make certain is that when the chips are down in society and the people who are essential for this society, when you look at them, a large number of blacks are among them. That's what we must insure. That's where we are weak, when every time we look and we try to—you know, when you get in you try to find out who's running something, and you try to find out who really does the thinking and does the planning, and I'm looking for a black and I can't find one anywhere along the line. I can find my Jewish friends, but I can't find blacks. That's where we need them. You see, that's where they are needed. And that is the most effective means of meeting racism. You can't meet racism with words. Words are only effective with us.

Comment: I think what we are avoiding, we are avoiding the primary task or the political nature of education. I think you have omitted that—we talk about Jews and we talk about black people, and you are talking about a number of things. One of these things happened to be a political position. Now, as to the whole fact of black using other experiences as an example of how we can motivate ourselves to that position, and that can be a very rotten position, you know; it can very well be a position that wouldn't promote the condition and liberation of black people.

So I'm simply saying I think education should be used as an instrument, and we cannot use education as some objective kind of thing, say that we want knowledge for the sake of knowledge. That's a luxury, and I think it's beautiful. But I don't think black educators can afford to do that. And I tell my students constantly that they are either educators or liberators or oppressors.

I think that to use education for the sake of knowledge, for knowledge's sake, black America in 1972 just can't afford that. You know, maybe in 1989 we can afford it. But we have to deal with the hard political issues and realities of education, and I didn't get that from what you said, you know. I just didn't.

Dr. Branson: Well, I thought I gave it, but you might be right.

Question: Dr. Branson, I think one—I agree with you that there is a need to make progress in the general direction that you have indicated. Perhaps one necessary ingredient on such progress would be a commonality of goals and motivation, I would say, between what we

term the middle class black and the lower class black. This commonality of interest does not presently exist. It's only recently that the middle class black has decided to look in the general direction of these less fortunate brothers.

So it will take a tremendous amount of time for any educated man to convince a black student from the back woods of Louisiana that that black student should follow the formuli that the educated black, who has been running away from him so long, is proposing.

So the main problem is that, perhaps, you and your colleagues here in your present positions are so close to the showcase of Washington, the showcase of opportunities for blacks that those things are so obvious to you that you cannot conceive of why every black person is not working hard to prepare for this opportunity. But the basic knowledge of the existence of these opportunities in American society is one that is lacking in many sections of the country. When you tell a student in the backwoods of Louisiana, again, "Prepare yourself for that," he is not yet going to overcome his feeling of insecurity about being accepted as an engineer or being accepted as someone else.

So for him to invest any lengthy time in this kind of preparation is indeed a risky business. So how do we convince him that he should accept our word that this is waiting at the end of the spectrum?

Dr. Branson: Well, we never just give a word. You must do something more than that, and I think—I won't go into details, but—and this is something that blacks have not just become recently concerned about. I taught at Howard University for 25 years, and all the while, I remember, I was always looking for black students who could read and write, and most of them were poorer than I was; I was poor as a churchmouse. The churchmouse took up a collection for me when I left for school, for example—No, no, I mean I think—well, put it this way: I don't think that what you were saying is a real situation. If, for example, to give a student individualized-attention—find out what his difficulties are, what his concerns are, and then try to show him that he is going to be living in this world we're talking about, and therefore, what should be the skills, understandings, competencies, which look like they would be valuable for him? And then try to aid him in gaining them. You're not going to make a hundred percent on this. He may disagree. They are going to disagree. But the point is, it's worth trying, and it's succeeding that way. It's certainly better than the scattergun approach.

DE-PAROCHIALIZING GENERAL EDUCATION

Albert Berrian

The proposition for general or liberal arts education presented in this paper represents an extension of earlier conclusions that the learning process must be viewed in association with the acquisition of basic skills and cognitive strengths. Knowledge is internalized, but the quality of this internalization cannot be disassociated from the learner's academic (and creative) capacities. It is, of course, possible to simplify the key concepts contained in a body of knowledge. Dr. M. Jourdan Atkinson,¹ demonstrated this in her "How the World Began," a child's reader in which key anthropological concepts are pictorialized and dramatized in story form. It is preferable, nevertheless, to assimilate new knowledge and concepts from a sophisticated verbal capacity. And while complexity is not always desirable for teaching-learning purposes, certain expected levels of grasping are more compatible than others with post-secondary approaches to education. It was for this reason that it has been proposed that students with lacunae in their skills and cognitive development be required to fill them in in combination with regular college courses that have been shored up by structured supports. The student, in order to be ready for a valid general or liberal arts education should have the capacity for the discovery of patterns, a feeling for the methods of science, the ability to draw inferences, and the ability to arrange ideas (spoken and written) in logical sequences. The ability to measure and calculate also represents a decided academic asset.

A good general education (or liberal arts education) at the collegiate level is based on reading flexibility and the capacity to handle a heavy reading load. The ability to handle different reading styles must also be acquired. If there are weaknesses in reading ability, regular courses should be supported by such texts as How to Read the Humanities, How to Read the Social Sciences and How to Read the Sciences. These works were produced by Brown and Adams, in collaboration with consultants from the disciplines involved between 1968-1970 and published by Scott, Foresman and Company. They emphasize exploration, vocabulary, analyzing for comprehension, and synthesizing for understanding, at the same time that they impart

concepts and principles germane to the common definition of liberal studies.

There are several definitions of general or liberal education, all of which can be gleaned from higher education bulletins describing the first two years of study in most disciplines. Within the British context, a considerable amount of general or liberal education is included in the academic diploma of the secondary school. If the student continues in the humanities or behavioral sciences, the liberal studies base provided by the secondary school is built upon and given breadth and depth. The German Arbitur is not too different from the British academic diploma, while the French année propédeutique and subsequent bachot represent the virtual completion of a student's general or liberal education; that is, unless the student follows a mathematics or natural science concentration. The new international baccalaureate, a UNESCO project based in Geneva and supported by the Ford Foundation and the Twentieth Century Fund is an outgrowth of planning for a general or liberal education, worked up from a secondary school perspective. In the United States one works from a collegial perspective. The result is that courses in the general education component of higher education are highly diversified and number 12 or more. The contrary of this are courses of a broad-based and interdisciplinary nature. The latter represent a more progressive approach to general or liberal education and will receive our attention during this discussion.

A liberal arts education, as it is reflected in such programs as the University of Oklahoma's Bachelor of Liberal Studies and Syracuse University's A.B. in Liberal Studies comprises three or four broad areas of knowledge: Humanities; Social Sciences; Natural Sciences; and Mathematics. The University of Oklahoma omits the latter, which we shall consider an error in academic judgment. Mathematics represents a method and set of procedures without which man would not have risen to high civilization. The development of mathematical-engineering technology, of magical triangles, of the numeration system, of cataloguing and sequential approaches to the organization of data and, finally, of the First, Second and Third Industrial Revolutions all point to the significance of mathematical ideas in the evolution of human civilizations. It is arguable, it should be added, that mathematical reasoning is a subject for the Humanities, in that it is a product of man's psychological and mental drives. Human beings, whatever their level of group culture, seem compelled to manipulate earthly (and heavenly) properties in some way, to speculate on distance and space, and to codify.

The de-parochialization of general education is a concept based on the assumption that mankind must be considered as a unit and his cultural products as a collectivity. Such a concept is counter-nationalistic, and while it does not question ethnic studies as a valid base for mounting and presenting knowledge, it does encourage the keeping of ethnic concerns within the perspective of de-parochialization. This position is consistent with Comer's assertion that mankind's different members have similar drives, unrelated to ethnic origins but "channeled by individual and group experiences."² Western education, not unlike other varieties of education, is underlined by socio-economic and political priorities and thus fails to achieve a high enough level of catholicity.

These priorities are not without thematic variations, for Western education is not a monolithic enterprise. Western culture has its nationalisms and its inner and outer rings. The educational focus for this culture is centered on the cultural history of the Caucasoids, who are presumed to have a unique capacity for creative endeavors and institutional organization.

Caucasoids, incidentally, are undefinable. There are 50 to 80 distinct ethnic groups in the Caucasus, the dividing line between Europe and Asia, who speak languages belonging to four major linguistic families. No one knows for certain whether the central Asian highlands truly represent the point of dispersion of the Caucasoids. They include such unrelated peoples as Teutons, Semites, Arabs and Dravidians. They do not, however, include Mongoloids and Negroids, except for the fifteen odd percent of these groups who are physically marginal. In short, the Caucasoid concept is a fiction and the development of a body of educational material based on it a tragic error. Egyptian-Nubian, Mediterranean, and Middle Eastern civilization were simply not developed by peoples of Northern European extraction or by peoples related to North Europeans, except that all men evolved from a common proto-human base. Further, the pretext that so-called Mongoloids and Negroids have contributed less than so-called Caucasoids to human cultural history has gotten us into a terrible mess that is not at all easy to get out of.

The term Western should not be allowed to indicate anything other than a social-economic condition for scholar-educators. This would help in the development of objectivity. The concept of race should be abandoned in favor of that of characteristic patterns and their continuations or disappearances within temporal and spatial

contexts. What we need is an educational system that will promote this approach among persons with academic skills and interests. Since blacks have been among the consciously excluded populations (and presumably have no vested interest in their continued exclusion) they are ideally suited to the promulgation of a more rationally-centered de-parochialized educational base. The accomplishment of this calls over the short-run, at least, for an education that attempts to review man's cultural history, the history of his natural settings, and the history of the sophisticated mythologies in which he has become ensnared.

To return to what we have at best, even a cursory examination of Syracuse University's A.B. in Liberal Studies reveals its deficiencies vis-a-vis the educational context recommended above. For example, the course in Humanities at Syracuse deals with the Classical and Medieval Worlds, then with the Renaissance and the Age of Reason, next with Romanticism and the Modern World, and finally with Independent Study in Particular Areas of the Literature, Philosophy and Fine Arts of the Western World. There is absolutely no attempt here to view Humanities in an intercultural or transnational context, except as these terms apply to Western civilizations. The opportunity to recognize man within the context of Europe-Asia-Africa or to use the Humanities to demonstrate cultural similarities as well as differences, and man's adaptive range, is lost. With the exception of one section in the first year of the course in Social Sciences, where introductory anthropology is dealt with, this opportunity is lost again. It is difficult to judge from the Syracuse catalogue whether that section of Mathematics dealing with mathematics in the realm of thought (fourth year) and of Biological and Physical Sciences dealing with the genetics of organisms, mechanism of evolution and the history and philosophy of the physical sciences (fourth year) capitalize on the opportunity to be more inclusive and expansive.

While the objectives spelled out in the University of Oklahoma's Bachelor of Liberal Studies do not indicate a deparochialized approach to knowledge, the reading list does indicate the possibility of an improvement over the narrow-gauged cultural approach characterizing the Syracuse program. McGinn and Howerton's Literature as a Fine Art is used to correlate the various historic styles of writing with styles of painting, sculpture, music and architecture at different times and during different cultures. Prototypes of modern forms of plastic and other artistic expressions are generally ignored, however, with one notable

exception. Sorell's The Dance Has Many Faces is comprehensive in that the sources and nature of the dance are treated, as well as the relationship of the dance to other art forms. In the suggested reading Will Durant's The Story of Philosophy and Hayakawa's Language in Thought and Action are used to compare cultural values. In fact, the comparison of oriental and western philosophies is one of the course objectives, and elements of American culture are traced to Western Europe, the Middle East and the Far East. Lin Yutang's The Wisdom of China and India is among the selected readings and add balance to the conception of the philosophies that have value.

The Social Sciences at Oklahoma also contain some work in Non-Western traditions. One of the texts used is Vera Mecheles Dean's The Nature of the Non-Western World. A question raised for study is: what are the important differences between what we usually call primitive cultures and the cultures of modern Western societies: Suggested readings include Felix Keesing's Cultural Anthropology, Dicken and Pitts' Introduction to Human Geography and Michael and Taylor's The Far East in the Modern World.

Theodosius Dobzansky's Evolution, Genetics and Man is used to focus on heredity, environment and mutation. Whether the opportunity is taken to debunk the myth of a hierarchical ordering of human populations is a question that is both critical and important. Roger J. Williams' Biochemical Individuality is used to document the biochemical differences of individual man, but it is not possible to tell from the descriptive material whether a man is considered a man "for a' that." An earnest attempt is made to provide the student with a historical view of man's development, and this is encouraging. The foundations of modern physical science are studied through Holton and Roller's book of the same name. This work stresses the contributions of the Greeks to astronomy; astronomy was first developed, however, by the Egyptians, Nubians, and Babylonians. This is left unnoticed.

Despite certain parochial features, as pointed out, the merits of the special educational programs at the Universities of Syracuse and Oklahoma are still quite good and an improvement over traditional liberal arts education. The integrative and inter-disciplinary approaches these programs utilize are to be applauded. The fact that these programs take place within the framework of independent study is not a point for discussion here. Independent study for culturally and educationally disadvantaged students is recommended only after their skills and cognitive deficiencies have been alleviated or removed. In

individual cases independent study can be recommended immediately, but this approach should not be employed generally, in view of present needs for early structure and the failure in which a lack of structure is likely to result.

A course in Humanities should begin with man and the earth; paleontology is a good starting point. Ashley Montagu, the British anthropologist who received his terminal degree at Columbia and taught at Harvard and Rutgers is a good modern source for subjects dealing with physical and cultural anthropology, heredity, human development³ and racism. Montagu, you may recall, drafted the celebrated UNESCO Declaration of 1950 on the question of races. His zoological classifications of man, his tracing of the evolution of man from the primates, his studies of the developments of peoples and cultures in general, and his work on the appearance of modern man and his cultures are quite objective. Montagu has made a penetrating analysis of the techniques of religion, ceremonies and rites, and of mythology and philosophy (see Les premiers ages de l'homme). One semester should be spent on Montagu, Herskovits (whose work, Cultural Anthropology contains excellent examples of so-called primitive literature and fertility rituals), Father Tempel's Bantu Philosophy, and Franz Boas' Race, Language and Culture. Boas' work is not only valuable for its clarification of anthropometry, which he claims was first developed to justify slavery, but for its sections on the racial history of man, the races of Europe and the races of America. O.S. Mezu's Tropical Dawn, as much for its preface which explains the basis of African poetry as for his own poetry, might terminate the semester's readings.

A second semester might include The Art of the Stone Age by Bondi, Breuil, Holms, et al, which introduces the cave paintings of Africa, southern Europe, and Germany. It also reinforces the meaning of ritual. Merriam's The Anthology of Music (1964), which treats the characteristics, functions, and societal values of music in non-Western non-classical cultures and Warren's Theory of Literature (1942) or a translation of Dufau and d'Alelio's Decouverte du poeme (1967). The latter work represents an admirable introduction to the techniques embodied in explication de texte.

Special work in ethnic studies should be available to students desiring it. Ethnic Studies, which follows a monocultural rather than an intercultural line of thought, find expression in some of the above recommendations. While an intercultural approach is preferable to a monocultural one, in the final analysis both are important to the goal

of de-parochialization. Afro-American Studies, which have recently established an acceptable model for Ethnic Studies, helps liberal studies as traditionally conceived to include legitimate academic areas that have been too long excluded. Henry Richards speaks eloquently to this point and states in his "Introduction to Black Studies, The Liberal Arts and Academic Standards" (from *Topics in Afro-American Studies*, Black Academy Press, 1971) that Black Studies "evidences the recognition of the interrelatedness of many aspects of the human experience which can be presented and studies through a fully interdisciplinary approach to education." Richards further maintains that the inclusion of ethnic studies topics in liberal studies curricula will help liberal studies achieve its avowed objective; that is, to prepare students to be effective world participants.

Social Sciences, like Humanities, should have its focus on man and the earth. In fact, readings in Social Sciences and Humanities (we might also add Natural Sciences) should be so parallel in the beginning that a clear line of demarcation between these areas could not be made. A good starting point for the Social Sciences, for example, is cultural geography. This subject dovetails with cultural anthropology, particularly as presented by Ashley Montagu, whose studies of ancient man have been recommended as a starting point for the Humanities. When the Natural Sciences are discussed, physical geography and geology, including Darwin's work on the spread and overlapping of plant and animal organisms, will be recommended as starting points. One need hardly explain the close relationships among these sub-specialities of broad disciplines or how these sub-specialities, properly presented and sequenced will introduce the student to the realities of both interrelationships and divergences.

One approach to emphasizing divergencies is to move in the Social Sciences from a study of cultural geography to a study of economic anthropology. This subject will, in reality, demonstrate variations on economic and social procedures rather than true divergences since, as mentioned above, mankind's different members have similar drives channeled by individual and group experiences. Early studies in economic anthropology were carried out by Bircher and Schurtz, a nineteenth century economist and social anthropologist respectively. These men attempted to show how ancient forms of labor, exchange and wealth were related in function to modern western forms. The economic obligations attached to kinship and household ties and the relationship of land rights to membership in a clan of lineage could be

made to parallel a consideration of Malinowski's work, if taught through the Humanities. Malinowski takes up the economic effects of magical beliefs and practices. A study of the transfer of goods to strengthen social and political ties in ancient societies will undoubtedly shed light on the principles underlying social ties and social unity in contemporary societies, both Western and non-Western.

Plato and Aristotle's works on the character of man and society, on social institutions and social processes should precede a study of the more modern authors. The study of political institutions and processes should be carried out in a similar manner. The theological, metaphysical and scientific roots of economics, sociology and political science should be prerequisite to a study of the more contemporary institutional models of these areas. Where sociology is concerned, Auguste Comte may be taken as a modern key. Cross references should be made between Comte and St. Simon, then between Comte and Emile Durkheim, next between Comte and David Hume, and finally between Comte and Immanuel Kant. Kant promoted, as we probably recall, the idea of positive determinism.

For an understanding of the roots of political or governmental activities, one should consult Chapter XVII of R. H. Lowie's Primitive Society (Boni and Livright, 1920). Lowie proposes that secret societies and the ritualistic initiation ceremonies that accompanied them provide the foundation for contemporary secret societies, gangs and even political parties. Incidentally, sophisticated forms of (or substitutes for) mutilation, normally associated with primitive initiation rites, occur in today's world. Lowie maintains that political parties are a survival and consequence of mankind's combativeness but presently act as substitutes for internecine warfare. Lowie's work should receive consideration as an introduction to contemporary institutional organization and practices.

Probably out of a need to find a sense of security in a threatening world, fourteenth and fifteenth-century Europe increasingly experienced what Shakespeare's Shylock referred to as "a lodged hate and certain loathing." To some extent these feelings were based in mercantilist competition and vented themselves on Westerners of the wrong (other) nationalities. Negroes, Moors and blackamoors (terms sometimes used interchangeably) were not hated, for they were not feared. Their physical characteristics were, in most cases, looked upon disparagingly. Likewise the Turkish and Jewish nose—in England, at least. Racism, as we presently understand it, did not flower until The

Age of Reason. It is important that all non-white and quasi-white minorities understand the evolution of color antipathy. In this connection, Harry Lee Faggett's Black and Other Minorities in Shakespeare's England (Prairie View Press, 1971) is recommended reading.

Dr. Faggett's work was first written in 1947 as a doctoral dissertation in the field of English. While it treats, in the main, topicality in Elizabethan drama, it has great value for the study of fear (international, inter-racial and inter-cultural) attitudes in sixteenth and seventeenth century England. These attitudes, lodged against Turks, Spaniards and Frenchmen on the international plane, Blacks and Moors on the inter-racial plane and Jews on the inter-cultural plane are contrasted with attitudes of disdain (where the Irish are concerned) and tolerance (where the Hindus, Gypsies, Dutchmen, Scots and Welshmen are concerned).

Ethnocentrism certainly has ancient origins, and as Tennyson observed, "The defects of the majority decide the type of beauty." Racism, as we presently understand it, had its origins in the slave trade,⁶ and its belief and practices have followed very conscious lines. One consequence of racism has been referred to in our discussion of the narrowly selected cultural material promoted in Western texts. While history does sometimes begin with Egypt, the home of a Mediterranean but racially marginal people, the contributions of the Babylonians, Semites in general, and Hindus to applied science and university-type organizations are rarely alluded to. The black man per se, with whom industry (the pebble industry is probably the first) very likely began and with whose ritual practices most of the arts had their origin, has been virtually eliminated from the human scene by Western scholars. In defense of these scholars, however, they are the product of an intellectual history that has been narrowly defined and tightly reinforced by pseudo-scientific dogma.

Religious and pseudo-scientific dogma served to justify the exploitation of peoples whose physiological and cultural evolution took place away from the cradles of civilization. In order to bring exploitative practices into harmony with Christian doctrine, it was necessary to question the humanity of the peoples being victimized or, at least, to give them a subordinate ranking within the framework of a race taxonomy. The justification of slavery, questioned to some extent in Renaissance England, was firmed up in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the high points of English, French and American

slave trading. The Germans, who had been producing naturalists since the mid-fifteenth century, created craniometric research. Blumenbach (1752-1840) established hierarchical orders of humankind and a faulty definition of the races of mankind that persisted until the 1950's. Our students should read in translation his Handbuch der vergleichende Anatomie und Physiologie (1824). Blumenbach was followed by the Comte de Gobineau, who authored the Essai sur les inegalites des races humaines (1853-1856). Gobineau, wittingly or otherwise, established a foundation for the Aryan philosophy of racial purity. The intellectual and academic processes leading to this philosophy and later to the politico-social basis for twentieth century fascism must be clearly understood by minority students, both for the purpose of their gaining a healthier self understanding and an in-depth general education.

Further work on the history of racism should not be necessary, but further work on race as a valid subject for investigation is highly recommended. The Blumenbach syndrome has recently been broken and some excellent research on race has been coming out in the United States. Race taxonomy as developed by Blumenbach was based on skin color. Hence the conception of five races: Caucasian or White, Malay or Brown, Yellow or Mongoloid, Black, and Red or American Indian. During the past generation, the Malays (who are really dark Orientals or possibly Negritos) became Caucasoid, and the American Indians became Mongoloid. The latter makes a certain amount of sense. In 1958 it occurred to William Boyd that there were perhaps as many as 13 races. The study of blood groups and the synthesis of anthropological and genetic thinking led C.S. Coon to raise this figure to 30 and McGarn to 32. The reading of T.B. Birdsell's Races (1950) and Social Class, Race and Psychological Development (1967) by Deutsch, Katz, Jensen, et al, would help to shed more light on this important subject and serve to bridge the Social and Natural Sciences.

There are ways to shade into the Natural Sciences from the Social Sciences, just as there are ways to shade into the Social Sciences from the Humanities. One approach to this is the utilization of classics such as Charles Darwin's The Voyage of the Beagle. The Beagle was a ship used in the exploration of the Island of St. Paul, a rock 3/4 of a mile around and 50 feet above the surface of the Atlantic, situated about 500 miles from the coast of Brazil. The purpose of this exploration was to study the effect of latitude (the distance north or south of the equator) on plant and animal life. Interesting comparisons were made possible on the Island, for changes in altitude in height above sea level

bring changes similar to those caused by differences in latitude. Plant and animal organisms overlap in closely connected zones, although short distances located in high altitudes bring marked differences in these organisms. A climb of two miles, for example, from the 1,000 foot level bring differences in plant and animal organisms tantamount to the distance from the southern United States to northern Canada. One can discern quickly the parallels possible here with racial shadings.

The work of the naturalists and the more recent work of physical geographers might be read profitably along with the work of the anthropologists, human geographers and those experimental psychologists who deal in bio-genetics. Keesing's Cultural Anthropology, Dicken and Pitts' Introduction to Human Geography and Dobzansky's Evolution, Genetics and Man, classified under Social Sciences would make good companion pieces to geological studies of the former and present links among the parts of the earth. Mention was made earlier of the failure of the Syracuse University A.B. in Liberal Studies to recognize man within the context of Europe-Asia-Africa. If this criticism is subjected to geological examination, certain geographical correspondences may be seen to emerge. Part of the African seaboard was once connected with these regions that now stretch beyond the Mediterranean. The Maltese Islands, for example, are fragmentary reminders of the ancient connections of Tunisia with Sicily and Italy. The flora and fauna of Northwest Africa, to cite another example, is essentially the same as that of the Mediterranean lowlands. The Ethiopian shore of the Red Sea, to continue, belongs to the same formations as the opposite coast of Arabia. We might, now, widen our frame of reference to embrace global configurations. The Ethiopian heights and those of Yemen form the remnants of a border range that sweeps around the Indian and Pacific Oceans from the Cape of Good Hope to the Horn. This sweep entails a semicircle that equals the circumference of the globe in length. The earth's organic unity as reflected in geological, behavioral, and humanistic terms is indeed remarkable.

We have alluded to Mathematics as a broad area of knowledge that should not be omitted in a general or liberal arts education curriculum. We have also talked about the basis for Mathematics in human behavior. We have not, however, suggested how the beginning study of Mathematics in a general education program might coincide with early courses in the Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. The practice of mapping can, I believe, provide the basis for a neat

dove-tailing.

All peoples, regardless of their level of civilization, engage in some kind of mapping activities. The Babylonians, as far as we know, were the first to make speculative maps of the world. They were followed by the Greeks, Hindus, and Arabians. The Greek, Erasthenes, measured the earth's circumference within several hundred miles of its true girth in the second century B.C. Several months later his countrymen, building upon interests in astronomy, brought map making as close to a science as the technological resources of their day would allow.

Hipparchus struck upon a scheme for using geodetic positions and a grid scheme of 360° of latitude and longitude for map making. Ptolemy, author of *Geography* in the second century A.D., extended Hipparchus' works and produced atlases of sectional maps of Europe, Africa and Asia. There were inaccuracies to be sure, but Ptolemy's work was considered authoritative until the Middle Ages.

The purpose of the above is to emphasize the transcultural nature of map making, as well as the human affinity for measuring distances, on flat surfaces, within spherical confines, and in space. To demonstrate the interdisciplinary nature of the knowledge that grew out of man's struggle to solve problems and satisfy felt needs, mathematicians might use this same phenomenon (cartographic practices) to illustrate the evolution of trigonometry. Hypsicles of Alexandria used chord functions of angles—developed by the Babylonians—to make computations. Some twenty years later Hipparchus, whom we mentioned above as a maker of sectional atlases, prepared a table of chords of circles to solve problems in astronomy. This table was used in a way similar to that in which we use a table of sines today. Hipparchus is credited with having introduced trigonometry as a science, as well as having introduced the scientific principles of cartography. The Hindus replaced the Hipparchus table of chords by one of half-chords. They, too, served as a table of sines. The Arabs then introduced other functions of angles and prepared tables for them. It was on these foundations that Johann Mueller built his *De Triangulis* in 1464 A.D., a time of European expansion and ascendancy. John Napier, Sir Isaac Newton, Euler and other followed. The important fact to be stressed—and, of course, the rediscovery of mathematical ideas will take place within a much more detailed framework than the one presented here—is that contemporary thought and culture are deeply rooted in a North African, Middle Eastern and Indian past.

In the Far East, and centuries before our abstract Greek thinkers

were born, the Chinese created the abacus and uses for it. They arranged numbers in square grids and in triangular patterns. The history of Chinese efforts has been recorded in recent publications for utilization by junior high school students, as witness the 1968 editions put out by the Meredith Corporation.⁷ It is somewhat ironic that more progress in preparing intercultural teaching materials is being made at the lower educational levels than at the higher levels. Perhaps one should not complain about this, but we must hope that emerging young scholars will not be better prepared for life than their instructors.

At this point, it seems appropriate to summarize what must appear to be a dizzying proposition, without a curriculum breakdown into areas, course components and their time frames. Two years are suggested for a total period of study for those students who are without serious verbal and computational deficiencies. For those whose verbal and mathematical skills are below twelfth grade levels, three years seem to be more appropriate, organized as follows:

Year I⁸

Courses 1 & 2 – Individualized reading and mathematics courses; symbolic or applied logic may be used as substitutes for mathematics.

Course 3 – How to Read the Humanities

Course 4 – How to Read the Social Sciences

Course 5 – How to Read the Natural Sciences

Course 6 – Communications Skills (emphasizing hearing, speaking, reading and writing)

Year II or Year I (if the student possesses twelfth grade academic skills)

Humanities I

Anthropology

–human evolution

–cultural geography

–Stone Age art

–ritual and its relationship to religion,
music, dance and literature

Social Sciences I

Anthropology

–physical geography

–pebble industry

- economic anthropology
- anthropometry and craniometrics
- comparative social organizations and interactions

Natural Sciences I

- geological epochs
- astronomy, its basis and development
- growth and applications of mathematic patterns to the phenomenon of growth
- Darwinism

Mathematics I

- ancient mapping activities
- the development of engineering technology and the reasons for it
- Problem solving needs leading to trigonometry, algebra, geometry and probability

Year III or Year II (if the student began with possession of twelfth grade skills)

Humanities 2

- Origins of the Classical World, the Classical World and selections from the great writers of the Classical and Medieval Worlds
- A course in World, African or Afro-American Literature, depending upon the students interests and major area of concentration

Social Sciences 2

- Historical development of sociology, social psychology, psychology and psychotherapy
- A regular college course in sociology, psychology or economics, depending upon the student's interests

Natural Sciences 2

- Biological science, with focus on the anatomy and physiology of plants and animals, cell chemistry, genetics and the mechanism of evolution
- A course in general chemistry or physics, depending upon the student's interests

Mathematics 2

- the methods of analysis
 - the methods of geometry and topology
- or

a selected course in mathematics depending upon the student's interest.

In conclusion, the following synopsis of "The De-parochialization of General Education" is presented:

The proposition for the de-parochialization of general or liberal arts education represents an extension of the proposition that the learning process must be viewed in association with the acquisition of basic skills and cognitive strengths. Knowledge must be internalized, and the quality of its internalization is closely related to the academic and creative capacities of the learner.

The model presented for a general or liberal arts education is that which groups general or liberal arts education into the following broad categories: Humanities; Social Sciences; Natural Sciences; and Mathematics. The continuing education programs at Syracuse and Oklahoma Universities are popular American examples of this format. The Oklahoma program does not include Mathematics among its concentrations, and this is taken to be a deficiency. Another deficiency, from which both programs suffer to one degree or another, is their parochial nature. Specifically, both suffer from the effects of Blumenbach's racial taxonomy and the effect that it has had on the organization and presentation of knowledge.

In order to offset the Blumenbach syndrome, a curriculum is proposed that introduces all four broad categories of general or liberal arts education within the context of the Humanities. In this way, their study begins in the human drives and practices that give rise to them. The development of each category is viewed along the lines of an inter and intra-cultural continuum. The discussion itself takes the form of an interdisciplinary minicourse, so that a microscopic model can be available to interested readers. For those students whose verbal skills are not well enough developed for them to follow key concepts in sophisticated form, Adams and Brown's works, Reading the Humanities, Reading the Social Sciences and Reading the Natural Sciences are recommended as supplementary material. These works are quite appropriate for college admits who have verbal deficiencies, and they were prepared for the benefit of these students.

References

1. Dr. Atkinson retired from Texas Southern University, where she taught history. The little reader in question grew out of a doctoral dissertation, written at the University of Oklahoma.
2. James Comer, "The Rescuer, The Masochist and the Ally," Yale Alumni Magazine, February, 1972. p. 22.
3. Montagu's tracing of man's ancestry should be supplemented by the well illustrated "Of Lemus and Men" by Ian Tattersall in the March 1972 edition of Natural History (The American Museum of Natural History, pp. 32-44). The lemurs, prosimian ancestors of man presently found in fairly large numbers on Madagascar, from the subject of Tattersall's article.
6. One of the best accounts of the slave trade is to be found in Philip Curtin's Atlantic Slave Trade (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969). This work is recommended reading.
7. See Mathematics Man's Key to Progress and From Fingers to Computers, The Franklin Mathematics Series, Chicago, 1968. See also The Pelican Series' Vision in Elementary Mathematics, Mathematician's Delight, The Search for Pattern, and A Path to Modern Mathematics, all written by the British mathematician, W.W. Sawyer.
8. Year I should be worth 14 hours of college credit, since the student will have accomplished what is expected of the college freshman in terms of verbal, communication and computational abilities.

Discussion

Dr. Berrian: If a man doesn't have basic skills, he has no business with a degree and has not business being thrown into a world that's becoming increasingly more competitive. It's unfair to the student.

Now, I know the question that you are going to raise is: How can they afford it? Our government is going to have to pay them while they stay that extra year. That's all. We just have to have some political clout and get those students some money and keep them alive. They have a right to an education in a civilization that requires an education.

You know, Herman, yesterday, mentioned some statistics which were very interesting. One that he didn't get into was: In the year 1980, it is estimated that there will be 15 million more jobs than there were in the year 1970, and, yet there will be three quarters of a million less jobs for laborers even with the 15 million increase in the year 1970 so that we are into a culture where the man who is semi-literate and the man who has no skills can't function.

I have been doing a paper for another group pointing out that black people in this country are on a treadmill. Presently, there is something like a half a million in college—and that's really a wild, outside guess—something like a half million college students among the black population of some, recognizably speaking, some 22 to 23 million people. In the year 1980, there will be something between 900,000 and 1,000,000 college graduates which will represent only 4% of our total population so there'll be 2½ million blacks that are unemployable in terms of the present times and educational trends that are taking place in this country. So while we move another four hundred or so thousand people through the baccalaureate, another million and a half will drop out of sight, and I question whether that's progress.

So we've got to guarantee that the person can function in a civilization that requires skills and a civilization that is both competitive and combative. And to give him a piece of paper that doesn't permit him to do that is sort of criminal.

Dr. Berrian: Of course, I don't recommend a lock step at all. Of course, if they want to, a lot of that material can be taught in the seventh grade depending on how you're organizing it. What I'm really talking about — I'm using the kind of traditional context that we used because we haven't developed as yet, you know, other means of getting this. What I'm talking about is kinds of knowledge and skills a student needs to be an independent person. And what I haven't talked about — Because that's a third paper — is some professional or paraprofessional kinds of components that can either blend into this kind of thing or be superimposed upon this kind of thing so this simply — That's why I said, "This will seem imperfect." It really should fit into a much broader study where it's sort of taken out, you know, out of this broader study. In New York we are experimenting with the baccalaureate students in their senior year of high school who will be taking their first year of college.

There's nothing to keep our students from doing that, you know, if they have the skills and the strengths to proceed so that when they come into the college, they may spend two and a half or three years. They may go ahead and spend seven or eight. But my position is that you cannot release them with a worthless piece of paper and turn them loose on society like ours. This is the only thing that I am saying: That it would be better to just frustrate them some more than it would be to hand them this piece of paper and turn a noncompetitive person loose in a competitive world.

Comment: It seems to me that as we think in terms of a new curriculum, we put a penalty on black studies. We say that a person must take all of the conventional things, the traditional things, in order to be educated, and then, somehow, we throw black studies in to support it. I think a person can really go through for a good strong major taking his regular whatever discipline he's in and take black studies as a minor, and this would be supportive enough to give him a good functional education in this society without any extended period.

I think that it is unrealistic to think that black students should stay in school for five years. If we are looking for that kind of thing, you are defeating the black person in the first place. We must find a way to get him out so he can get in the competitive market quickly. We can't get enough money to keep these students in school we have now.

And I think the next fallacy is to feel that all education must somehow be essentially the same for people to function effectively. You don't need — I contend the A&M graduate functions effectively, but he has something different from the Harvard graduate so anytime we think in terms of a black-focused program per se for the black college we are wrong because black colleges are different.

Dr. Berrian: I don't know. If you look at this society from a purely manpower point of view, then these things become a little clearer. And what I've been trying to do — you know — on my own is to ask myself the question: How many people will be working in the year X and what will they be doing?

I don't know how else to look at an educational enterprise. One of the problems in our country is that we haven't done that, you know. For example, I know the black colleges turn out lots and lots of elementary and secondary school teachers. I also know that the country which absorbs something like 260,000 of these teachers last year will only be absorbing 200,000 of these people eight years from now, and the opportunities for employment within this area are drying up. You know, there's just no ifs, ands or buts about it. The growth of the birth rate has leveled off. It's been leveled for four or five years. There will be a need for fewer and fewer people who are going into this kind of thing. I didn't get into that, you see, that's another paper. You have to look at what the job opportunities are in America for black people — for any people.

What we really have to look at is what the new jobs are going to be rather than what the old jobs are because we never got in there, and we're going to have to get into the new jobs. And from what I've

looked at in these 15 million new jobs, I've got a breakdown of where these jobs are.

Thirty-five percent of those new jobs call for a baccalaureate degree — thirty-five percent of that 15 million new jobs. So what I'm saying is: the future for us is in higher education. It's in higher education that severely organized so that if these jobs open up, we can compete for them.

There is some future in certain paraprofessional areas. You have to find out how many people can we logically get into these paraprofessional fields so we can organize our program in, you know, a kind of manpower context. They need systems analysts, mathematician, people in business and there seems that there might be a need for more engineers. Incidentally, what we don't need are people with bachelor degrees in liberal arts, and I'm not recommending that. You'll notice that the program that I talk about stops with the sophomore year, and I have said nothing here about what kind of education a person really needs to function professionally, you know, in the larger society. It's a real can of worms.

Question: Dr. Berrian, I noticed in your commentary awhile ago you mentioned this business of the kind of course you teach at Hampton in teacher education. I was particularly interested in your last remarks that you mentioned about employment in teacher education particularly in elementary and secondary schools. I wonder if you would comment a little on the original premise that is implied that if we continue to traditionalize our teachers in preparation, that we would have that kind of situation.

But in the light of the new thrust in urban education and the things we've talked about in the last two or three years, isn't this kind of figure as far as the number of unemployed teachers — Isn't that sort of misrepresentative of the premises of what we are doing now in urban education and in some other things?

Dr. Berrian: Well, I think that this gives us an opportunity. I don't think there are going to be any more jobs, you know, other than the ones I cited, but I think that if we can demonstrate that we prepare people whose characteristics and training are unique and can handle this problem that the country is saddled with — because our problems are urban problems — that there will be a market for our graduates. If we can bring something very special to bear on the problem and resolve some of these problems — I think that market is only good if we do something special in it, and I see no indication to this point that we

have. This comes close to getting at that problem.

But there're other things that have to be done, you know, to make black educators in elementary and secondary schools any more innovative than any other kinds of educators in these schools. I'm not convinced, for example, that in northern New Jersey, where I hail from, that black educators do any better in those school systems than white educators because I think their attitudes are faulty; and, in many cases, they are more dangerous because they feel threatened by this black mass that they feel will undo the little upward mobility that they've already acquired so that I think there's a place in the black institutions to create educators whose attitudes and skills are such that they will be more functional in dealing with our children. And if we do that, then we have something to offer, if not, nothing.

Question: Dr. Berrian, a good many of the sources you mentioned awhile ago were very stimulating. I think all of us could see how exciting some of these courses could be. I wonder if it might also be that some of the compelling magic of a successful course depends on the interest of the teacher in what he is doing, and I wonder whether in listing some of these courses in view of theory, if you thought you were dealing with universals or whether to some extent you felt that the contents might be variable if the investment of the teacher in the interest field might also vary.

Dr. Berrian: There has to be variations then; you're right. I was dealing with universals, but where there are variations there are certain kinds of knowledge and information that you can't cut out.

The only thing that I really say is: The student must understand his earth and how it got to where it is, man and how he evolved to where he is and how different ethnic groups are similar and different, and he must understand that there are certain mythologies and why they came into being and that would solve the problem of his self-image, you know, what he understands — the economic and political forces and the brute struggle for survival because this is what we're really talking about — Back in 1630 where all this business was beginning, its development, Western Europeans represented only 20% of the earth's population and then suddenly because of advanced technology, they are the ones whose birthrate jumped so that proportionately speaking their rise in population has not taken place in the third world — so-called third world — it has taken place in Western European man. Now what's happening is that by the year 2000, he will be back to 20% of the earth's population. He's 22% now of the earth's

population so there's a survival problem here, and out of these survival needs, economic needs and political needs there grew out a political economic strategy for survival.

Now, as long as the black students understand that, he'll lose a lot of his feelings about his worth et cetera, et cetera, and he can get on with the business, you know, of getting an education in a much healthier frame of mind. So there are only about six or seven types of things that I've talked about here in absolute terms, and the rest of it is subject to a great deal of variability and modification.

Question: If we are, then, concerned with strategies for survival in past eras, I'm wondering to what extent should not this kind of study be done in regard to present survival patterns in analyzing the needs and necessities to survive in modern day culture with using this as a perspective and emphasizing present-day survival strategies.

Dr. Berrian: Yes. That's part of the function of education, you see. A healthy concept, self-concept, is fundamental to survival and self-perpetuation so that's at the very root of what I'm recommending. I may seem not to be recommending black studies, for example, but I am recommending black studies. I've redefined it. I've reached behind, you know, the present day definition of what we call black studies, and I've given what to me seems a much more solid foundation from the one it presently had.

I'm also talking about having certain skills, academic skills and cognitive strengths that make you competitive on examinations that are really testing your capacity to discriminate. You know, I mentioned a whole variety of things: to see patterns, to move from scientific positions — these are all parts of the survival strategy in a world that is becoming more and more professionally oriented. When I say "world", I don't really mean world. I mean a country that is becoming more professionally oriented. In addition to this, there are some alternative patterns for students who don't want to go that route. He might want to go a post secondary route by going another way. And then there's the question of how does he build now his professional strengths on top of his general skills and his basic education, and I haven't dealt with that. Actually, what I'm really saying to you is that I really didn't get into that, but I understand the need for it.

What I am really talking about is: The students want a certain kind of education, but there's a certain body of general knowledge that belongs to an education that does, you know, belong to a general education. That's all I'm saying. The student is perfectly free to take a

terminal route, you know, a more short run terminal route in a community college, but that does a very different kind of thing for them than this kind of thing does. You know, I'm talking about a student who says that he wants a baccalaureate, and he wants to say that he is educated. That's very different, you know, from the student who says: "I want employment, and I want to get there as fast as I can." You see, you need different types of people so I'd never recommend this for everybody, but I'm not recommending cutting anything out for the kind of people that I want to be my leaders.

You know, you've got to have a leadership cadre, you see. Leaders are people who have a sense of history.

Question: But is it necessarily true that an American society that those people who are going to get into positions of leadership always have this historical viewpoint before assuming the position. Is it now true that sometimes they acquire this after they have developed themselves to this position of leadership?

Dr. Berrian: I'm afraid that these people have a sense of history anyway. They know who they are and where they come from and where they are going. They are the manipulators of this society. Existential people are not good manipulators. Let people who want to be existential go ahead. There's room for them, too. But I'm saying that if we are going to join — and I'm going to use that term no matter how offensive it may sound — the "intellectual aristocracy" of this nation, then we are going to have to have a sense of world history and contemporary history and geological history. You have to know these things. We have to know what we are manipulating. You can't manipulate what you don't understand.

Delegate: But is it not true that the intellectual society is not the group that is running the country. Is it not true that the manipulators are the ones running the country?

Dr. Berrian: They are the intellectuals. You are thinking of the scholars. But they are the intellectuals. The ones that are running the country are the intellectuals.

Dr. Berrian: Well, actually the students at Hampton can get a major in black studies. We just don't call it that. You see, the moment you call it a major they cop out so they go ahead, and they take a major in it. And they graduate. And someone says, "So what do you do?" And you say, "Black studies." What we've created for the student, but since we don't call it a major, it holds him to having a major, you know, along some traditional line so that when he gets out of the

college, he's free now to pursue a traditional line of development within the society in which he lives or he's free if he wants to go to one of these schools that offers a masters in black studies, to go take one because he's got all the courses he needs. But the moment you call it a major the student now can cop out so that there's nothing wrong with a minor in black studies. There's really nothing wrong with a major in black studies, but I say it's dangerous to give them a major because that's what they'll major in.

Question: I have two or three questions related in some kind of sense, I guess. I have two or three questions.

One: I question your whole idea of classical versus non-classical, classical education versus the whole idea of non-traditional or unorthodox education. I think maybe your basic premise or basic rationale using your kind of rigid course outline that you have to deal with general education — I'm not convinced that that's applicable to black colleges. I think it's good to talk about certain kinds of history courses. I think it's good, you know, even if I give you or admit that your whole definition of classical is universal, what are you saying? You are defining universal — It seems to me — in a very traditional manner.

You are defining "universal" in a sense that is not applicable to black colleges. I think that even if that were the case, and you were right; you were correct, you still would have to deal—It would seem to me—with the conditions and the specific conditions of black students on black campuses. It seems to me that that should be a starting point. Then go to those other things you outlined in your talk. Because I think if we don't do that, we commit the same kinds of fallacies that we've been committing all along.

Now, I don't see us as black educators or scholars or both maybe forging any kind of new forms for black students to deal with the lifestyle now — including jobs, including racism or anything you want to talk about. I think that what you are doing — You are putting us into very slick kind of traditional bag that we've been in all the time. I think that if we are going to do those kind of things that we aren't really about the business of educating black students. Now, that's our primary concern so it seems to me that our primary premise should be: What is there within that black community that we call universal that is applicable to black students all over. And then let's go from that point to the greater one.

I don't think we should start from the European basis because we start there from day one. You can see the results of that. We here now

have been brainwashed, propagandized in a certain kind of way because most of us at one time or another attended a white university where we were taught like black scholars who had attended certain institutions, but I think your premise is wrong.

I think if you reversed that premise and tried to deal with some of those things -- For instance, it's very normal for you to say, "Take this course. Take that course." You say Afro-American studies depending upon the student's interest, but you never make that point when you refer to those other kinds of European courses. I don't think that's the kind of way to deal with black curriculum. That's my opinion. You have yours, of course.

Dr. Berrian: Well, I didn't say it very well, you know. I didn't really focus on it as I should.

The kinds of courses that I'm talking about are not European courses. I'm talking about beginning with man, and what I've tried to say is: Man begins in Africa. How black can you get, you know?

I say that he -- we have to talk about where he crawled out of the earth, and that is Mother Africa so that's where we begin, and I think I understand the nature of your question. And it is really a classic polarization that we are talking about here. It's the kind of polarization that has gotten the English-speaking African and the French-speaking Africans into difficulty. And what it comes down to is: How does one use cultural-educational material?

Do you use it to further political ends? That's really the question. And there are some persons who believe that there is no such thing as talking about education and culture without talking about things political. Now, all I have to do is grant the validity of that -- And I partly do -- and I can swing over to your point of view so it's a question of what do we want to do with education not how do we want to use it. If we use it for ends that are primarily political, then I would say your point of view is a very valid one.

Comment: Yeah. Okay. Well, people at Harvard don't call things they teach -- They don't call it politics of this and that, but it is quite clear that the courses you take at Harvard, Yale or any of the black schools now -- They have a certain bent to them. You know, we can talk about objectivity all day long. You know, I've talked about objectivity all day long, but I think it's a meaningless kind of exercise. In one sense it is because they don't call those political, but it's very clear that the direction of those courses turn out very docile kinds of scholars -- people that do and advocate certain things, certain kinds of

knowledge.

It seems to me that those courses have been taught by those white educators to the survival of the white community, and they also have been taught to influence and to indoctrinate black scholars not to the black point of view or the black perspective but from the white perspective. And I think it seems to me, although you said it starts in Africa, the best of what you are saying does not deal with the conditions of a quite highly deprived people. I think we should be about that business. I think we've gone through all kinds of dialogues. I think you have to admit that even the content of what they teach at these white universities are political in nature. The content is political.

Dr. Berrian: But see, no white school that I know of has that curriculum. You see, if you adopt this kind of curriculum, write your own content. All I'm talking about is certain subject matter areas. I haven't said anything about who's going to develop the material, how you're going to handle it. You are free to do anything you like with it.

But what I'm really trying to say is: I'm fascinated over the student of revolution among other things. I'm always fascinated by the American approach to revolution. It has no ideological base. It has no framework. It has no thought that precedes the action or if it has any thought, it hasn't been drawn out very carefully. I'm saying if you want to use education for long-range or even short-range political purposes, you'd better make sure that the student has a baggage of material that they can use to construct themselves a solid framework from which to move so that nothing I say really obviates — It's the timing; it's the sequence that we are talking about.

Comment: I don't want to talk too much, but that's the important thing: the sequence, the basis, the foundation is important, you see. I mean most of us were victims of the premise that you just talked about a long time ago. We have to know all of those things that are white and all of those things that are black. The ironic thing is that we haven't known very much about those black things.

Okay. I am saying the basis of starting educational processes should be shifted whereas the premise would deal with those things that we are particularly in one sense and then go to the universal and universal by definition has been defined as being white all the time. I'm saying that we should at least reverse that and give black students a chance to move. One would assume then that we have to work out a comprehensive ideology to deal with black problems, and I think the teaching of black students. I don't approach education without having

some kind of idea of what I'm doing, idea of themes for the struggle and survival of a people. I think if we start from that particular specific point of view, you are dealing with that theme. We are dealing with ideology.

SOME BASIC ISSUES OF GENERAL-LIBERAL EDUCATION

Harold Delaney

Many of the issues facing higher education find their source in a complex mixture of traditional assertions that compose a matrix of ill-defined and poorly stated objectives. The assertions have evolved from Western European elitism in higher education, and they have collided forcibly with the demand for change or outright rejection by the American concept of universal opportunity for formalized education. The persistence of many of the assertions has been possible because the successful events of the past cannot be denied. We have come to realize, however, that success was being achieved by a relatively small portion of the population. As college enrollments expanded and the population gaining admission demonstrated a natural diversity, the traditional educational machinery began to reveal its fundamental weakness. The weakness was that it functioned quite well as long as it dealt only with those students who had a rather limited set of characteristics which permitted a self-sustaining pattern of success, but it simply could not adjust to the demands of a more diverse student population.

Any objective analysis of intellectual elitism as it relates to higher education must give recognition to its importance in pulling mankind from the enslavement of ignorance and superstition. At the same time, however, one cannot help but be aware its benefits may have still been reserved for an exclusive few if it had not been for a number of historical developments. Most educational historians agree that the creation of the land grant institutions was of unique importance. The great success of those institutions in agriculture certainly depended in great measure on the fact that just prior to their beginning, the field of chemistry, particularly organic, was developing at a very rapid pace as both an intellectual and pragmatic discipline. When we add to these developments the freeing of black slaves, we have almost all of the critical elements that are responsible for many of the basic issues facing higher education today. It is against the background of this historical perspective that predominantly black colleges must view their educational goals and missions, and thereby their curricular structures.

The particular facet of the historical perspective to which this

paper is addressed is the impact that the three developments listed above have had on the deliberations regarding general-liberal education. Hopefully, a consideration of that impact will reveal what curricular changes, if any, a predominantly black institution should implement.

One of the accessories of intellectual elitist education is that there is an explicit core of knowledge which provides the essential basis of worthwhile education. This core of knowledge is not likely to relate to pragmatic concerns initially, but will do so in some fundamental way that may become apparent only to the most intellectually insightful persons. Such an education, it was argued, was the most liberating kind because it tended to reveal values and truths that were independent of time and place. The most traditional of our liberal arts colleges today continue to accept this concept as the basis of their academic mission. Although acceptance of this notion of a liberal education was never universal, disenchantment with it grew with the emergence and growth of the land grant institutions and public higher education in general. Most probably this was due to two factors. One factor was the dramatic demonstration of the immense pragmatic worth of higher education and the other was the increasing diversity of student populations. Both of these influences have been intensified by the growth in enrollment of black students. This has been true because black students see the pragmatic side of education as offering a pathway to the main economic stream of American society, and because their cultural orientation adds another dimension to the diversity of students.

One of the early adjustments to the classical notion of a liberal education was the formulation of what is usually called general education. Although one explanation of the difference between liberal and general was that the former places emphasis on content whereas the latter emphasizes the learner, the actual practices of most institutions did very little to distinguish between them. In recent years there is increasing tendency to talk about them interchangeably. It is for that reason that the term, "general-liberal" is used in this discussion. Suffice it to say that disenchantment with the classical approach has led to the necessity of clarifying terms or adopting a new definition for operational purposes.

As a framework for the remainder of this discussion, we shall use the following definition: a general-liberal education is an academic process that maximizes at every academic level the freedom and capability with which an individual seeks and finds his identity in a society of other individuals whose freedom and capability of search and

discovery are similarly maximized. A number of inferences may be drawn from this definition. A brief discussion of some of these influences follows.

The first inference to be drawn is that every general-liberal education program must be characterized by a diversity of content and pedagogic approaches. This is so because the definition places emphasis on the effect that general-liberal education has on the individual. Even though black students have a common experiential background imposed by racial oppression and discrimination, their biochemical individualities nevertheless dominate their responses to their experiences and thus to an academic program. Indeed one might argue quite validly that diversity of educational programs in a predominantly black institution may carry a special mandate in order to deal more effectively with the deprivations of the past. Whether the special mandate exists or not is secondary to the importance of diversity in its own right.

The second inference is the recognition that the traditional separation of curriculums into those courses called liberal arts and those that are professional or vocational may no longer be valid. Bertrand Russell once wrote: "In a good social system, every man will be at once a hero, a common man, and a cog, to the greatest possible extent, though if he is any one of these in an exceptional degree his other two roles may be diminished. Qua hero, a man should have the opportunity of initiative; qua common man, he should have security; qua cog, he should be useful. A nation cannot achieve excellence by any one of these alone." Although formalized education is not the only process by which an individual becomes hero, common man and cog, it is perhaps in this period of history the most important. Thus it is incumbent upon our institutions to promulgate educational processes that fashion pathways to security and usefulness, while at the same time liberating the mind into sponsorship of initiative and innovation.

During the last two decades much effort has gone into the investigation of the problem concerned with whether creativity and intelligence are distinctive factors within total intellectuality. The question is far from being resolved, although the evidence accumulated thus far seems to support the view that they may indeed be separate traits, though quite clearly they must interact. The third inference then is that the blurring of the distinction between liberal arts and professional courses is probably consistent with the recognition of creativity and intelligence as distinct factors. The consistency lies in the

awareness of the contribution that professional or vocational courses may make to the opportunity of becoming useful in society and at the same time providing the chance for creative development. If creativity may be related to initiative, then the essential role that professional courses may play in liberating a student becomes clear. The academic point to be made is that creativity in all its guises is to be regarded as a legitimate facet of the intellectual enterprise, and special curriculums or adaptations of existing ones should take this into account. This may have particular significance to black students because society has demanded from them a high degree of creativity for survival. This must somehow be channeled into the academic stream.

The definition of general-liberal education above is activated by the word "maximizes". Any student who brings with him or her to the classroom a socially imposed impediment to the acquisition of a liberalizing education may prompt an appropriate adjustment of the academic program and require counseling of the most astute kind. This is the fourth inference. The intent is not to suggest that a major revision in a curriculum is necessary to meet the peculiar needs of individual students handicapped by society. What is being suggested though is that institutional rules should be regarded as guidelines and not as sacred edicts for providing the best education possible for each student.

Finally, a sense of identity is a sense of confidence. The climate within which the educational process occurs must be one that helps to build that confidence. This kind of climate must pervade the campus inside and outside the classroom. It does not occur automatically but requires the collective effort of the entire college community, formally and informally. The larger an institution becomes, the more difficult it is to achieve, and therefore a limit of size may be called for.

A definition of general-liberal education has been presented that implies the need for a diversity of curricula to meet the varying needs and characteristics of students. It further implies that it is no longer valid to maintain a sharp distinction between what is liberal arts and what is professional, and that the minimizing of such distinction allows the development of curricula that recognize creativity as proper academic business. Finally, the definition also suggests that socially imposed impediments to gaining a general-liberal education may require special curricular adjustments and counseling, and that all of the foregoing will be least effective unless the educational process occurs in a climate that builds confidence among the students.

THE BLACK COLLEGE'S RENAISSANCE: ACADEMIC BLUEPRINT FOR THE NEW BLACK STUDENT

Chuck Stone

In a grudgingly, but slowly expanding open society, it is one of the ruthless ironies of history that the traditionally black college's struggle to survive has reached a crisis of epidemic proportions.

More black students than ever—412,000¹—are enrolled in higher education. Federal appropriations for higher education—\$2.4 billion—are at an all-time high.

And yet, black colleges today are enjoying neither the parity of black student enrollment nor Federal funds. For reasons I'll enumerate later, black colleges are not even maintaining a stable ration of black students in higher education. Within a short four-year period, 1964-68, the total college enrollment of black students declined from a majority of 51% in black colleges to 36%. Concomitantly, during this same four-year period, the percentage of black student enrollment in white colleges increased from 49% to 64%.²

That dramatic, almost unheralded shift resulted from the limited gains of the civil rights movement in the 1960's. White colleges, under intensified government and integration organizational pressures to pluralize their student bodies, initiated black recruitment policies. At the same time, a different type of movement incubated in the black community, began exerting pressures for the same goal—more Black students in college, but using a more radical strategy. The black consciousness movement, inspired by the mesmerizing impact of "Black Power," and what was to subsequently be called "the Black Revolution," de-emphasized the integration ethic as a desirable social and educational goal. Instead, white colleges were asked to set up Black Studies departments and courses, black dorms, and an admissions policy which was usually based on white-black parity in the national population.

The confluence of these seemingly incongruous social forces impaled the black college on the horns of a quadripartite paradox from which it has yet to derive any educational or financial benefits. First, the integration movement helped to significantly multiply the number of black students entering white colleges. Second, the white colleges, to

meet the challenge of swelling numbers of black students, many of whom did not meet the established criteria for admissions, classified these students as "disadvantaged" and were rewarded with large Federal grants and foundation funds for "disadvantaged student programs."

Third, the black consciousness movement accelerated demands on white colleges for more black-oriented courses, black professors and administrators, black living and social arrangements and a liberalized admissions policy to attract more black students. Fourth, with an abundant availability of various Federal financial aid programs, black students began applying in greater numbers, not to black colleges, but to white colleges. Black students' desire to attend a prestige college (prestige being equated with white), the aggressive competition of white college admissions offices for outstanding black students, the establishment of special academic reinforcement programs and the attempt to create a learning environment more hospitable to the black experience through various social innovations, all have combined to motivate black students to seek their educational advancement at white colleges.

This then is the historical paradox in which the black college now finds itself. Having educated the Supreme Court lawyers, having produced the civil rights leaders and freedom fighters and having provided an intellectual haven for the philosophy of integration, the black colleges are now being diminished by the very successes they spawned. Their influence in American education is at an all-time low.

Some of us might be tempted to shed tears of sorrow for the attenuation of black colleges, but it is an educational fact that the black college has been one of the most obstinately traditional, educationally stagnant, white-middle-class-oriented institutions in America. As was true of many then Negro institutions, they were all caught sleeping at the status quo switch by the Black Revolution's ideology. The black college resisted change as passionately as its most conservative peers.

Instead of immediately adapting to the dynamics of a new black ideology among young blacks, black colleges remained largely aloof from the struggle for liberation, trying vainly to continue as Harvard and Yale universities in black-face. The empirical evidence of your failure to win the confidence of the new black generation lies in three recent social developments:

1. the arithmetic decline of black students in black colleges accompanied by a geometrical increase of black students in white colleges—in an era that has extolled

- blackness and its pre-eminence in our lives.
2. the shift of black students to the rapidly increasing number of community and junior colleges, many of which are being established in large northern, urban centers. (It is interesting to note, however, that black students are not yet attending two-year public colleges in the same proportion as their white classmates. According to a recent study conducted by the College Scholarship Service, of over 8,000 students in 1970, 17% of all white college students are attending public two-year colleges compared to approximately half that percentage of all black college students, 9%.³ This same study also revealed that 41% of all black students are attending private four-year colleges compared to only 27% of all white students, an indication that black students have yet to appreciate the community college as a financially viable option and an educational equal.
 3. the growth of what has come to be known as "independent black institutions" (IBIs). This designation implies that the traditionally black institutions (TBIs)⁴ which all of you here represent are not controlled by educators who "think black" or black administrators or even black trustees and that in some unascertainable way, you are totally beholden to, if not controlled by the "white power structure."

There is little question that this country, for the first time in its 196 year old existence, is in the midst of an educational revolution—a revolution in methodology and administration as much as pedagogy and curriculum. The traditional ways of teaching, counseling, testing and running a school system are no longer considered guarantees of successful educational outcomes.

There is a widening diversity of differential pedagogical strategies being introduced into our school systems—computerized instruction, open classrooms, instruction by television, individualized prescribed instruction and schools without walls. In addition, new guidance and counseling programs for minority students such as CUNY's SEEK program, open admissions policies, weighted admissions predictors such as Bowdoin College's making college entrance examination scores optional, the development of potentially new disciplines such as Urban Studies and Black Studies, performance contracting, educational

vouchers, and new emphases on postsecondary vocational education are only a few of the changes which are slowly radicalizing American education in the 1970's.

And yet, most black colleges are still doing business as if they were operating in the 1950's.

Educational change is imperative and it must be implemented fast just to keep pace with technological changes. Black colleges must take the lead on several fronts to reach the untapped reserves of black students who still are not audacious enough to think about going to college. There is absolutely no way white colleges can absorb an additional 300,000 black students if the black community is going to reach its parity of 12% Black students in higher education.

The reason white colleges will not be able to absorb those additional 300,000 black students is because many of them are already trying to figure out how they can cut back on the 253,000 black students they have on their campuses now! While that statement is made with some hyperbolic jest, it does contain substantial truth because of the racial tension and strains being placed on white college budgets and educational facilities by low income, culturally divergent black students from ghetto backgrounds.

On the other hand, many outstanding universities are continuing to fulfill their academic commitment to a pluralistic student body. One of the most historically racist institutions in America, Princeton University, will have an entering freshman class of 1976 of 213 Blacks (11%), 74 Asian-Americans, 47 Puerto Ricans or Cubans, 24 Chicanos and six Native Americans.

As other prestigious and academically superior institutions follow Princeton in pluralizing their student bodies with ethnic parities, even average black students will be siphoned off from black college student bodies. Those 300,000 untapped black students represent your challenge and to reach them, you must change.

There are eight changes which black colleges must implement in order to achieve the new educational relevance which the black community expects of them. They are all interrelated. Changes in general studies are meaningless without the rest.

First, adopt an open admissions policy. It is prima facie absurd for black colleges whose students are scoring an average of 300 to 380 on the SAT to utilize this score as a primary predictor for admission. Not only are high school grades more accurate predictors of academic success for black and white students, but the black colleges must take

the lead in humanizing its admissions policy by developing what I call multiple predictors—high school record, evidence of community leadership, community involvement, motivation, evidence of self-study, evidence of a pattern of late academic achievement in high school, evidence of creative or divergent thinking and interviews with local alumni or designated representatives. Black colleges must let it be known that if a black student is interested in attending college, somehow—just as Dr. Charles Hurst, President of Malcolm X College in Chicago has done—a way will be found for that student to attend.

Second, expand your guidance and counseling departments. American education has neglected guidance and counseling in the educational process and treated it as an academic stepchild. For black students who have been turned off by an insensitive urban experience or black students whose instruction in rural schools has barely qualified them for 10th grade, much less college, a careful diagnosis of their shortcomings by guidance counselors with planned peer tutorial programs in which upper classmen are paid to tutor can make the difference between pass and failure.

But I would submit to you today that you compound the inability of low income black students to think seriously about attending college when you force them to take college admissions tests; a.) for which they are cognitively ill-equipped, b.) which do not have the same predictive validity for blacks as for whites, c.) which have not been as an integral part of black secondary education as for middle-class whites, and d.) whose fees are an ab initio financial burden on black families.

This leads to the mandated third change in black colleges—a more humanistic use of norm-referenced testing and a prohibition of its continued misuse. Standardized testing in America has become unfortunately an oppressively racist instrument. Black colleges become complicitous partners in the erosion of their existence when they participate in the misuse of standardized tests for black students. Dr. William Brazziel, professor of higher education at the University of Connecticut and one of the most distinguished and compassionate black educational psychologists in America, had this to say about tests in a recent paper presented before the recent National Education Association's conference on testing and violation of human rights:

"Thousands of minority children are denied equal access to quality education each year because of flaws in the testing apparatus of our schools. This situation is illegal, immoral and more, it is becoming untenable."

"There are at least 20 class action suits in various parts of the country seeking to force school districts to cease and desist in the inaccurate testing of minority children ..."

"More and more people are losing confidence in the schools and the spectacle of a testing apparatus in disarray will do little to restore this confidence."

Dr. Brazziel then suggested that to measure progress—and I would add college admissions—"criterion referenced tests" should be used instead of norm-based achievement tests.

Humanizing the testing process means making it relevant to the black experience and not permitting it to be used as Dr. Elias Blake has said, "as a reinforcement of negative self-images." If existing norm-referenced tests don't adequately serve your purpose, pool your resources and have new tests developed.

Even the research at one of the obstinate custodians of the psychometric status quo, the Educational Testing Service, supports the educational imperative for new college admissions tests. ETS simply refuses to change because of its ITT-mentality that wishes to protect its monopolistic vested interest.

But a recently concluded ETS research program known as Project Access showed that black students from two major cities and chicano students in one of those cities demonstrated small, but consistent tendencies to perform better, relative to whites, on three nontraditional measures: tests of inductive reasoning, spatial scanning and associative memory.

The author of the report, Ronald L. Flaugher, a research psychologist at ETS, then quotes the College Board's 1970 "Report of the Commission on Tests" in which one of the members, an authority on cognitive learning, John Carroll, recommended expansion of the number of component parts of the SAT to four or five reported scores to more accurately measure other abilities besides "purely verbal, purely mathematical."

Flaugher concludes: "Certainly a comparable case could be made to justify the separation of the mathematics score from the reasoning score.... The results of the present study, then, seem compatible with the suggestions of the Commission on tests to expand the number of measures in traditional testing programs. Further, if it were necessary to choose the particular measures that should be included, then the method of inductive reasoning, spatial aptitude and associative memory could be recommended. Existing measures of other cognitive factors

need to be explored, however, as do other measures of those same factors."⁵

One other aspect of standardized testing in the college admissions process must be quickly alluded to. This is the issue of equal predictive validity of such tests for whites and blacks. ETS has a curious way of affirming that claim by saying the tests predict "about as well" for blacks as they do for whites.

They don't. In the fall 1971 issue of the College Board Review, an article asked the question, "Is the SAT Biased Against Black Students?" The article combined two separate studies and analyzed the predictive validities of SAT scores for white and black students in 19 colleges. They found that in seven or 36% of the 19 colleges, there were no significant correlations between SAT scores and black college freshman grades compared to only one of the colleges which had non-significant correlations for white students.

The black students at the 19 colleges also had a lower median validity coefficient—.26—compared to the white students' median validity coefficient of .38.⁶

It is obvious from ETS's own research, the massively antagonistic attitudes of minority groups against ETS and other testing industrial corporations that critical changes must be made in the philosophy, the content and the administration of standardized testing instruments which are used for college admissions. And the black college must take the lead in this direction. I would suggest you begin with the Association of Black Psychologists.

But, the most important change, number four, the black college must make in its educational infrastructure is in freshman curriculum and pedagogy.

If we begin with the premise that the purpose of education is environmental mastery through a maximization of personal skills, then black students must be taught cybernetic skills in a highly technological, electronic and computerized society in order not to become a surplus people. (If the Black Revolution were to be successful tomorrow and we defeated white America and took over, the country would come to a grinding halt and the greatest threat to a sustained black suzerainty might be those oppressed black mothers on welfare who would rise up in righteous wrath when their welfare checks failed to arrive on time simply because there were not enough trained brothers and sisters to operate those computers all over the country.)

Black colleges must require the mastery of three basic skills—

reading comprehension, mathematical reasoning and the ability to organize one's thoughts on paper. I deliberately did not say "readin', 'ritin' and 'rithmetic" but instead placed an emphasis on those precise skills necessary for most professions, but only so much as is necessary. It is a sorrowful waste of time to require several courses of math if a student is not going to use it later in life. A recent survey of 100 colleges by David A. Abramson, director of curriculum development for the New York City Board of Education, showed that at two-thirds of the surveyed institutions, no correlation existed between the requirements for admission and the requirements for an undergraduate degree. When is the last time you correlated your admissions and graduation requirements?

Black colleges must reorganize their curriculum and their pedagogy with the underlying premise that they are going to be teaching an educationally underprivileged, low-achieving, but highly motivated "disadvantaged" black freshman student who may not know the names of Herman Melville, Chaucer and Nathaniel Hawthorne, but who is hip to Eldridge Cleaver, Malcolm X and Franz Fanon.

This fourth change then, necessitates a shift to equally black humanities and social sciences in the freshman year.

Black students, in this era of heightened ethnic sensitivities, come out of a black experience that has awakened a bursting pride in their black legacy and black existence. Despite the thrust toward integration, the living experience of the majority of black students in this country is contained within a predominantly black society. The decision to attend college is a conscious one and an extension of their ghettoed lifestyles.

They are no longer required to attend school as a matter of law. Consequently, once they enter college, they expect the curriculum to be geared to two levels; 1.) blackness and 2.) learning ease. All students, black and white, expect college to be an intellectual training ground for skill enhancement. Black students expect to understand who they are.

Thus, there can be little doubt among most educators that it is far easier to communicate to the average black college freshman in America, a black interpretation of American history, comparative black literary styles, black poetry, black music, the history of black American writers, and black sociology than the standard white-oriented academic fare prepared for white middle-class America.

Bear in mind, I am talking only about the freshman year during which the black college freshman would be exposed to only black-oriented social sciences and humanities from which he or she could

select options. These black courses, coupled with a required course in mathematical reasoning and a basic sciences course (biology or chemistry) would constitute the basis for the freshman curriculum.

The purpose of a heavily and "heavy" as the dudes would say, black curriculum in the freshman year is to immediately place the black freshman at ease by providing a comfortable learning environment in which he and she can explore with emotional security and academic authority, the intellectual dimensions of the black experience for the first time. This would also reinforce for the black student a positive image of a black curriculum as a basis for cognitive development.

Such materials must be geared to the cognitive level of the entering freshmen. It is patently silly for black colleges to offer freshmen courses and reading materials identical to those offered at white colleges when black students are scoring 250 to 300 on the SAT compared to white students who are scoring 550 to 600. There is nothing academically scandalous about offering easier courses in the freshman year. Just as easier tests are better predictors of black student achievement⁷ by enabling admissions officers to sort out a wider range of abilities among a homogenized group of low achievers, so easier freshmen courses will elicit for black college teachers a more enthusiastic response to the learning experience.

It is at the second or sophomore year that the black college student should be eased into those traditional courses and studies required for advanced professional school or advanced studies. If the student wishes to continue to major in Black Studies—just as white students continue to major in Russian Studies, Asian Studies, Chinese Studies, Italian Studies, Jewish Studies and all those other ethnic group studies—that course of study should be encouraged. On the other hand, more careful and empathetic counseling—something which is generally not characteristic of the average college today, white or black—can guide the student into a choice of alternative professional careers.

Coupled with totally black-oriented freshman courses is a required fifth educational change—the black college's adoption of differential pedagogical strategies, ranging from pass-fail grading, seminars, and off-campus classroom sessions in black community institutions, to independent study, use of individualized prescribed instructional materials, and extended courses which permit the student to take more than the normal period of time to complete a course—without academic penalties. There is no divinely ordered science that demands students

must finish a course at the same time as all other students, especially when there is such a wide disparity in learning proficiencies.

What divergent thinking strengths that exist among black students must be developed and nurtured to improve their convergent thinking processes. The black student who can "play the dozens," who can recite the sinking of the Titanic and the signifying monkey and can carry around in his head the "numbers" that hit on the last 10 days has the capabilities for self-elaborative thinking, despite what Dr. Jensen says. But those black cognitive processes are not strengthened by reading only literature or materials which in today's sociological experience are racist, hostile and irrelevant to the past immediacy of his social experiences.

The sixth educational change for black colleges lies in the development of new curriculum more relevant to the problems of the 1970's, especially those problems most intimately affecting blacks.

Black colleges have been molasses slow to become the intimate authorities in African, Black and Urban Studies. It seems such an appalling incongruity that the majority of outstanding black scholars today are on white campuses. Salaries have been a major factor, yes, but how many black colleges have been willing to provide the options for writing and research to intellectuals which so many white colleges do. All of you must be able to afford at least one chair for one black scholar. And if you can't, combine the salaries of two full time equivalent positions and create a chair. I'm always astonished what white people can do when they want to effectuate change. They'll throw tradition to the winds just to move with the times. President Nixon went to China and we're still worrying about him coming to Harlem. At a recent convocation at Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education charted new curriculum priorities for black colleges. Very gently, he suggested that black colleges, "as a consequence of their mission and history, should become the focal points for scholarly studies concerning Afro-Americans and become the key institutions in this new, complex, and desirable discipline." How many black colleges have a Black Studies major?

Dr. Marland also recognized the logical role black colleges must play in urban studies as "Black Americans continue to become a more urban people." It is in the black colleges that many of today's urban pathologies can be solved—educational deficiencies, racial tensions, air pollution, crime, transportation inefficiencies, industrial development in inner cities and new housing programs.

To develop these new curriculum, studies and pedagogical strategies, the black colleges must have a research focus to test them out. This would be the seventh change—the establishment on each black college campus of a Laboratory Experiment for Academic Progress—LEAP. Under LEAP, all types of academic innovations could be carefully researched and then adopted. New curriculum, new instructional strategies and new socially oriented programs such as courses in nearby prisons could be developed.

With a prison population that is slowly becoming a black majority, men, who read and are like their brothers on the outside, black-oriented, it is amazing that the black colleges have not taken the lead in developing sociology courses and departments in criminology and educational and rehabilitative programs for prisoners. Are we afraid of ourselves?

The eighth and final change for black colleges is a simple one—start honoring black heroes in our commencements and convocations.

If you change your curriculum by introducing more courses on black history, black sociology, black politics and black literature, you neutralize your efforts when you fail to present to your student bodies the academic heroes behind these disciplines.

For the historical record, let it be said here today before all of you that the one man who guided legislation through the U.S. House of Representatives to bolster your sagging budgets—Adam Clayton Powell—never received an honorary degree from any of the 105 Black colleges during his Chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee. You were too busy academically shuffling to white racist value judgments to pay tribute to this political black titan of history.

The black college must decide where it wishes to place its priorities. We talk about the imperative for "reordering our national priorities." Yet, to what extent is the black college prepared to reorder its academic priorities, radically restructure its curriculum, concentrate on specific areas of professional expertise, and begin to develop programs for technical skills such as electronic engineering, communications specialists, journalists, urbanologists, and city planning?

I was terribly dismayed when the Black Congressional Caucus chose to hold its recent Conference on National Priorities at M.I.T. Nor did it make much sense to me for the Caucus to hold its recent Conference on education at the Marriott Hotel.

There must have been at least one black college which could have

offered its facilities free to the Caucus for those two important conferences.

But I suspect that the Caucus is looking at the black college with the same jaundiced educational myopia as the rest of the nation—a small struggling group of institutions of higher education that are not as relevant to contemporary America as they would like to be or should be.

Young Americans, white and black, are a far more sophisticated and enlightened generation than those 10 years ago. Even if a black student does poorly in high school and cannot achieve acceptable scores on college admission tests, he or she still wants desperately to attend college because they know that unless they do, they are going to end up on the slag heap of the working force of a racist society which is already opposed to their advancement.

Black students know they are both racially and psychologically black. As a generation, they enjoy an encompassing pride in blackness which eluded many of us. They have begun to follow the advice contained in the title of one of the late and beloved Adam Clayton Powell's favorite sermons—"Think Big and Think Black."

Thinking black means that you expect those institutions committed to the development of your community to be leaders of social change, the catalysts for economic control and political governance.

The black college must decide what constitutes the bare essentials of an excellent education—not as Harvard, Yale or Princeton or Stanford teaches—but as Hampton, Fort Valley, Jackson State and Texas Southern teaches.

Those 300,000 yet untapped black college students are not going to score 500 on the SAT, nor are they going to be "A" students. They are simply going to be average, maybe mediocre or even inferior students who need guidance toward careers in a society where they can maximize their skills and talents. They are increasingly militant and together. They don't want to read *Moby Dick* unless they need to know about the white whale for the GRE. Nor are they interested in the legal structure of France unless it's necessary to pass the LSAT.

Unless the black colleges can recognize that the black students waiting to attend college are what has been called "a different breed of cat," there is that very unhappy prospect that the black colleges could well become the dinosaurs of American education.

22,000,000 black people, however, have too much pride in you to

permit that untoward development. The extent to which you succeed will be reflected by the boldness with which you innovate educational change and become the leading intellectual force in the black communities which is where your academic strength begins and will be ultimately sustained.

References

1. The number of black students in college range from 492,000 estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Census in May, 1970 to 397,000, a figure compiled by U.S. Office of Education's Office of Civil Rights, from a survey of 2,500 institutions of higher education in September, 1970.
2. From Isolation to Mainstream, a Report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, February, 1971.
3. "How College Students Finance Their Education," College Scholarship Service of CEEB, November 1971.
4. Minority Access to College, Fred E. Crossland, A Ford Foundation Report, 1971.
5. "Minority vs. Majority Group Performance on an Aptitude Test Battery" by Ronald L. Flaugher; Educational Testing Service Research Bulletin 71-48, August 1971.
6. "Is the SAT Biased Against the Black Student?" J. A. Davis and George Temp; College Board Review, Fall 1971.
7. "Easier Test Improves Prediction of Black Students' College Grades" by John R. Hills and Julian C. Stanley; Journal of Negro Education, 1970.

Delaney and Stone Discussion

Question: Why did you restrict your adjective to Freshman year?

Mr. Stone: I thought very frankly, and I made that clear that if a kid wants to go get his Ph.D. or Master's, he has to take the GRE in most colleges. The GRE as presently structured has a heavy infusion of white literature. There is very very little black literature. He has to master that or the LSAT. Mathematical reasoning is very important on the LSAT for those tests, those courses in graduate and professional schools. NTE, for instance. He has to master those. He can't take only black literature, only black poetry. That would be dumb anyway, only black. He has to have the total society.

Question: If you were in the South with a state institution in which a little better than one-fifth of your students were white, how would you go about instituting a curriculum that was all black for freshmen?

Mr. Stone: Well, you are getting—If you have a little better than one-fifth, I'm talking about black colleges in which statistics are 99 to 98%. Obviously, a state institution where you've got a sizable number of whites, you can't make it mandatory to generally take black courses. But I'd have those black courses as an option where a kid could either take American history or black history or for Byron, Keats and Shelley he could take Walker, Hughes and Lee. I'd have the options listed side by side my freshman year because I'm sure if you tried to make them all black social scientists, one-fifth or one-fourth of your students that were white—you would have some severe political pressures. I'm not so unpragmatic as to realize that you couldn't do that.

Question: Chuck, on your suggestion that we shift to a totally black humanities-social science curriculum at the freshman year, at the end of your statement you made what appeared to me a suggestion that these courses by the nature of their content are easy courses. I don't think—

Mr. Stone: I'm sorry. I mentioned the comfortable learning environment, the whole affective element in cognitive achievement that the student feels comfortable taking a black—I mentioned to you that class, you know, Great Expectations.

That place would have been turned on if they had been reading The Autobiography of Malcom X. And some of this is difficult. It's not easy. There's a number of novels and poetry of great difficulty to understand and in terms of meter, structure and so forth.

I don't mean to imply that you can teach the student more. The transition is mostly that from the black experience at home in the ghetto to a college to make a second transition to a general stage in his sophomore or junior or senior year. By no means, black courses should not be considered gut courses, it is the professor or the school's fault when they do that. In fact, when I was teaching a course in a black literature at Trinity, I had six black students. I gave four D's out of six.

Comment: Let's not delude ourselves, ladies and gentlemen. We've all—many of us including myself—have been offered professorships, visiting professorships and whatnot in white colleges simply because they have to have a black face. You're nothing more than that. They have to obtain their federal grants, and we're there for that

purpose. Let's not delude ourselves.

Dr. Delaney: May I just add to that because I worked with a state-wide system which has grown tremendously with Sam Gould's leadership. Along with that growth, of course, has been a dramatic increase in the amount of black students. It doesn't mean that they are there in the proportions that they should be, but the point that I am making is that these black students need to have black faces in front of them, too.

And it has been one of the great reservoirs of wealth that only the black colleges have had in the past that they had a closed market on black scholars. Do not forget that when a black scholar goes to a white—a formerly all-white institution in some of the urban areas that he is going to be talking and teaching and being with black students, too. And in many ways he is a psychological advantage to those students who have never seen blacks in that kind of position. For example, in New York City, Chicago, and Detroit, even though the school—the pupil enrollment may be 90% black but almost never saw a black instructor, a black principal or black superintendent of schools.

Some of these things may change. In these Northern communities with a large black group of students, they may take the advantage of having lived with them, and positions of administrative leadership get black faces. The evils of the past do not distinguish between the innocent and the guilty of the later period, and so all of us have to pay for this. We cannot slough this off completely.

Now, I'm not arguing the fact that there are some faculty members who are doing that today purely on the basis of economics, but I think the point that Al Berrian made this morning about the fact—Here is a man in the position of policy making for the entire educational systems—public and private—in the state of New York. Now, that's a rare position to be in, and I do think it's essential to have his point of view, his force and that position. He had to come from somewhere because the past history was—While Chuck said that he had the opportunity of going to a predominantly white school, if you count people in his age group, my age group in the North that are college trained that are black, you'll find that a great vast majority of them were trained in these predominantly black institutions of the South. That's the way it went, but we are in a different era, and I think we do a disservice to ourselves if we become distressed because we see happening the kind of thing that has to happen. What is critical to us and we must never forget it is that our job is to see to it that these kids

are educated properly. We're going to have to do some things differently from the way we did it in the past. And my own personal attitude is that the curriculum structure is not the only route that leads to a sense of identity.

Indeed, there are some black youngsters—And I think I resent the notion that they are oreos. That's a popular way to describe them, but there are black youngsters who have been so much a part of the Western culture, which we all have been. When you look at the technology around you, the people are taping all over the place. That's Western culture. These youngsters will be lost to the race if we don't turn them on. They may be—some of them may be turned on by the classical approach to education. And if that turns them on, then we will reap benefits from them 15 years from now and 20 years from now. That's money in the bank. And so I do not get upset by—If you talk to the black students in the state university of New York, they'll usually tell you that they don't have enough black faculty members up there, and they don't.

Where are they going to come from? Well, of course, one thing we have to do—It seems to me—is somehow accelerate the—increase more rapidly the preparation of black faces with appropriate academic credentials, but I don't think that sells us short. We're talking about where we want to be 15 years from now, and nobody in here can predict too easily where we'll be 15 years from now. Thank you.

Question: Mr. Stone, there may be two questions I have here. I'm concerned about the historical perspective, the whole thrust in this country about integration of our society across the board. We are talking in terms of producing equality gradually as we move toward this whole idea of integration. With this background in mind, at the expense of sounding stupid, we talk about giving a person black experience against this background. Could you help me, please?

Mr. Stone: You can't give them a black experience. What you can do is academically reinforce his existing black experience. You can provide legitimate academic authority for the undifferentiated black experience that he feels. In other words, you can provide black heroes for him—black writers, black poets, black historians. At a college two years ago, I quoted from Julius Lester's book: Look out Whitey! Black power's gon' get your Mama! None of the students had heard of Julius Lester. I've covered 100 black authors living today in Living Black. This is the black experience. You can't give anyone the black experience but you can academically reinforce it with academic legitimacy,

respectability—as he said, the gentleman over there—to create a pride in your black professors, and there are—Benjamin Quarles and John Hope Franklin, all of these black authorities in their fields, and Charles Hamilton and others. You can just go on and on in history and English and so forth.

They are your kind of people. You can speak to the human experience through the black medium. That is, you can't give anybody a black experience.

Being black does not mean being anti-white or anti-human. That's also the purpose of education—to humanize the human being.

If you teach the black experience and he turns out—Just as the white student leaves the white college hating black people, he's not educated; if the black student leaves the black college hating white people, he's not educated. So the black college has a commitment to help the student know who he is. So there's a larger humanity to which he should be committed. I think that has to come out of the black—only the black colleges can do that. Students at black colleges don't want to hear it. They don't want to hear anything about white folks or anything like that, but I say your students are increasingly becoming more pragmatic about manipulating the system. You've got more black students working in elections than you did two years ago. White students had discovered this before, but now they are moving to work in certain political campaigns and so forth.

But you've got to master the system to learn how to manipulate it. You can't do it by sitting back and contemplating your black navel.

Comment: Some of the rebuttals and excuses that have been directed to you as well as to Dr. Delaney are, I think, really manifestations of that resistance to change that you related to earlier in your talk. The group here has a large conservative element, and I think that even in instances when an idea might be a good idea; it might be a practical idea; yet, there might be some bottlenecks that you can envision, I don't think the idea has to always be abandoned in the name of an excuse.

Let us take, for example, Dr. Delaney made—I think he recommended that creativity should be instituted as a new discipline. Okay. Hypothetically, some of us might say, "Well, the state legislators are not going to buy that; and, therefore, we suggest abandoning it." You know, at that level. It's my contention that we could still teach creativity or we could emphasize creativity to a larger extent in the courses that we teach. And it's not emphasized in many instances in the

courses that we teach. There are a lot of ways you can teach creativity without teaching it as a discipline so what I'm attempting to say is: Put aside trying to achieve some of the good suggestions if they cannot be instituted in the form they are presented, these might be a middle road we can take without resorting to the other extreme which is complete abandonment.

DEVELOPMENTS IN NON-TRADITIONAL STUDY

Samuel Gould

My purpose this evening is to set forth for you as clearly and succinctly as I can the backgrounds that have brought about the tremendous interest that presently exists in non-traditional education, to explain what its characteristics are, to touch upon its educational and financial implications, and thus to lead to our discussion together of where your institutions may find themselves as a result of this new movement. It is a large body of material to absorb in one sitting. Many questions will still remain unanswered after we are finished. But you may possibly develop from all this a heightened awareness of what is currently happening and see opportunities for yourselves that are worthwhile.

In the next few hours, therefore, I propose to take you with me through an exploration of the anatomy of non-traditional study. And I trust that as I do so, you will be placing my remarks against your knowledge of your own college, what it is and what it hopes to be, what its possibilities and limitations are, and what adaptations you see for yourself in becoming an active part of this rather revolutionary change.

If we are to understand completely why education stands today on such unsure footing with whirlpools of change swirling around it and giving it less and less traditional stability, then perhaps we should consider some of the larger circumstances that create the whirlpools. We should also consider the good and the bad about them, how they are likely to affect education, and whether there are or should be ways of assessing and controlling or guiding these effects. Undisciplined and disorderly change leads inevitably to chaos, even though it may be very tempting as a reaction to earlier rigidities and absurdities. This is true in our total lives as well as in the part we devote to education. Education, after all, is no more than one of the major components subject to pressures from the larger society today.

We have arrived at a time in the academic world, therefore, when real choices are about to be made. They can be forced upon us or we can direct them. And make no mistake about it, they will be forced upon us unless we in education act with more speed, more

forthrightness, more initiative, more intelligence, and more ingenuity than we have hitherto displayed. If we do not act, others will act for us. The mood of the American people in its assessment of educational need is one demanding a new recognition of and a new adaptation to the forces that shape our destiny as a nation.

What is emerging thus far from this mood is no clear or clarion call. It is a cacophony of protest against far more than current educational philosophy and practice. It is an angry but confused set of confrontations about many matters, a series of clouded realizations that all is not well, a rising tide of mistrust and bewilderment. We see this on every front: the political, the social, the economic, the educational, and even the religious. Revelations of unexplained but at least outwardly dubious dealings in politically high places have shaken the traditional faith and pride of the citizen in his country and her motives. Revelations of the gap between promises and achievement in social progress have embittered whole segments of our population and caused them to feel that our democratic and egalitarian ideals are a mockery. Revelations of some of the methods and goals of modern economic life have re-intensified the long struggle of class against class. Revelations of outworn methodologies or obsolescent subject matter or growing disregard of the individual, together with an almost arrogant reluctance even to be questioned, have placed our educational institutions not merely in their traditional ivory tower but beyond the pale. Even the church has come in for its share of accusations, and seems split within itself on matters fundamental to the spiritual life of man.

From all this, in spite of the confusion and bewilderment and sometimes the white-hot anger, a new pattern of life is beginning to show its design. It is not confined to youth, although youth are among its leaders. It is not confined to minorities, although their voices are loud in protest. It is not only the white-collar or the blue-collar worker, the small businessman or the conservationist or the priest. It is suddenly everyone — the medieval Everyman of the morality play risen again and seeing the sins that surround him — confronted by fear that what he always thought strong and right and immutable is crumbling before his very eyes, seized with an urge to repudiate what has been allowed to happen, stimulated by an overwhelming desire to find a better way. He sees the glass darkly, but he is not about to wait too long for it to clear before he moves. Nor is he in a mood to worry at the outset as to whether he moves in the right or wrong direction.

Strangely enough, every aspect of today's sense of revulsion

against what we have always termed American traditions is founded upon the traditions themselves. We are not witnessing a revolt against American ideals; we are seeing the result of neglect. It is a revolt against the means rather than the ends, the ponderousness and sometimes the pretentiousness of these means, the quality and attitude of the minds who devise and direct these means. This is a point worth pausing over and illustrating.

Egalitarianism is a tradition finding its roots in our Constitution and stated again and again as the keystone on which every democratic principle is built and every democratic action is taken. But even after two hundred years this is still an unfulfilled tradition, and its progress toward fulfillment is deliberate in speed and sometimes reluctant in motivation. In education it is represented by the concept of full opportunity, the idea that every man or woman, regardless of age or circumstances, shall have access to as much education as is of benefit. Elementary and secondary education are the most successful examples to which we can point, and the land-grant and community college movements represent major successes in higher education. But in the latter there are still great gaps, segments of our population unserved, inequities in the quality of education offered, and a persistent lack of unanimity about how valid the tradition itself actually is. And so the current impatience of those who seek more educational options grows more intense. A new insistence is prevalent that additional ways must be found, and swiftly, to bring this tradition close to reality for those hitherto denied.

Protection of our natural resources is another long-standing tradition, not so long as that of full educational opportunity, but long enough. Yet here again the patience of the American people is wearing thin as they see the results of man-made pollution and despoilment all around them. With their own health and those of future generations hanging in the balance, they find it difficult to understand why every corrective move must be so slowly and grudgingly made. Their inevitable conclusion is that non-traditional ways must be found to counteract the deliberateness and force the issue to a speedier solution.

The dignity and freedom of the individual is a highly prized tradition in America. But we live in an age that worships bigness for its own sake and is allowing technology to become not just the maker of tools but the shaper of men. As this occurs, individual man disappears steadily into the mass and becomes more and more a manipulated being, caught in the grip of the mass media, computers, and a huge

bureaucratic impersonality. Even in education, where he should least expect it, he finds himself swept into a great collective system that makes him feel puny and of no account, slavishly gathering course hours and credits according to standard patterns that brook few exceptions. And so he shows his rebelliousness in every way he can: in his dress, his speech, his life style, his independently created courses of study outside the institution's curriculum, his contempt for his elders, and his repudiation of everything traditional. Yet all he is seeking is what traditionally has always been deemed desirable and, in fact, necessary: a place in the sun as a person, as an individual.

An informed people, with truth as the touchstone of information, is similarly an American tradition. To be free to speak, to be free to ask questions and get honest answers, to form judgments on the basis of a full background of knowledge — this has always been part of our heritage. But adherence to this tradition is often more honored in the breach rather than its observance. Truth is partial, at best, and honest persuasion is frequently supplanted by cleverness and even chicanery, whether the task is one of selling a product or explaining a public policy. The confidence of the citizen is shaken when he is repeatedly bilked or cheated or misled. Eventually he becomes suspicious of all products or all statements. It is small wonder that he is resentful and looks for new ways to guarantee his right to know what is real and true rather than what appears to be.

Out of attitudes such as these — the desire to believe in and hold onto traditional values, the growing realization that these values are still relatively unachieved as goals, the recognition that efforts toward their achievement are slow and forced — out of these has sprung the current vogue of the non-traditional approach to problem-solving and to life itself. The new literature, music, theatre, arts, and styles of living all reflect a breaking with the past and a rush to create and live in a different sort of world as quickly as possible.

We are witnessing, therefore, the birth of a tradition to be non-traditional, to move away from the norm, to prize individuality and independence above all else — and perhaps, by so doing, to give new strength and power and meaning and reality to the selfsame traditions that have always been part of the American dream. Even in its present nebulous or only partially defined state and even with a great body of hostility surrounding it, the swing toward the non-traditional as a way of life is the largest and potentially most powerful movement in America. It touches everyone in one way or another even

when he opposes it, and it influences his thinking and actions whether or not he is consciously aware of the fact. It can be a tremendous force for good or evil, for productive reformation or disastrous revolution, depending on how well and with what good order and speed it can be understood and assimilated in our land.

This is the framework, therefore, within which education must now try to adjust its sights, re-assess its experience, and fashion new possibilities. And this is the framework within which non-traditional study was bound to emerge.

To put the matter of non-traditional study in its simplest terms, it represents a group of changing educational patterns caused by the changing needs and changing opportunities of society. A good deal of it is not new; indeed, there have always been non-traditional approaches to education in one place or another, some of them very successful. But new awakenings to new needs by new and hitherto unserved segments of our population, together with strong dissatisfactions with traditional results from those segments traditionally served, have not catapulted non-traditional study to a position in the forefront of public attention. It has suddenly been "discovered" by federal and state government agencies as well as by individuals in and outside the academic world. And, as might naturally be expected, it is already surrounded with a good deal of confusion, not only as to what it is but as to what it can be expected to do.

I suppose this is why the Commission on Non-Traditional Study came into being. The twenty-six member group, sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board together with the Educational Testing Service and mainly financed by the Carnegie Corporation, was deemed necessary in view of the rising interest, the variety of efforts planned and under way, and the general lack of clarity about what these new forms are or can be and what influences they may bring to bear on education. Its purpose is to take a careful and independent look at what is evolving, to make some judgments and evaluations, and eventually to offer some recommendations for the future.

The major patterns of non-traditional study have to do with four general areas, all of which lack far more information about them than is presently available. We can identify these much more easily than we can offer full explanations or documented detail, yet for our purposes today even their identification and what knowledge we have of them may be of some help.

The first set of these patterns is woven around the philosophy of

"full educational opportunity." Its goal is to assure to everyone, regardless of age, previous formal education, or circumstances of life, the amount and type of education that will be of benefit in adding to his potential as a person. It is a democratic philosophy, in keeping with the principles upon which America has developed as a nation. We have been more and more vocal about supporting it for the past several decades. But we have never completely understood exactly what we meant by full opportunity, and so we have as yet moved toward its fulfillment in fits and starts without reaching the ultimate goal.

Some of us talk about "open admissions" as a philosophy with precisely the same characteristics as "full opportunity" and thus add to the confusion. Perhaps a good deal of this is semantic hair-splitting and can be ignored. There is, in fact, at least one vital similarity between the two: the increase of educational options for the student based on his expectations. But there seems also to be at least one vital difference, according to the interpretation of "open admissions" in some quarters: "full opportunity" should have a much stronger selective factor, in that it should determine who should be offered more education because of his capability and the strength of his motivation. This entails a testing process not for exclusion but for appropriate inclusion. It also places great stress upon a more sophisticated and far-reaching set of guidance procedures so as to establish realistic, attainable, and worthwhile goals for each individual. The right of each individual to more education is championed and protected, but only on the basis of his capability and motivation.

Within this pattern of full opportunity are a number of other, more specific strands, all of which represent major departure and major problems. These are problems not only for academic faculty and administrators but for political leaders who must make policy decisions as to the paths public institutions will follow. There is, for example, the need to accommodate segments of our population as yet largely ignored — women who wish to take up studies again once freed from so many household duties, returning war veterans, retired men and women, inmates of penal institutions, employed people who wish to improve their situations, professionals or para-professionals who find they must keep up-to-date — a widely diversified group who seek in some fairly systematic way to enrich their lives. There is the enormous problem of the minorities whose promise and opportunities are still unfulfilled. There is the need to re-examine vocational education: its availability, its methods, its goals, its relation to manpower use in this country. There

is the sudden turning of attention to the "external degree," with its popular appeal and its latent dangers. There is even the current move toward exploration of a whole new kind of higher education system, apart from the traditional institutions now in existence, either as a parallel to what we now have or to replace it almost completely. All these needs and pressures stem from the mood of democratization, of insistence that great additional numbers must be served, that full opportunity to rise on the educational scale must somehow be provided.

The second set of patterns emerges logically from the first. It includes elements of structure, method, content, and procedures that combine to create a new flexibility in education. Non-traditional study seeks to loosen the present rigidities in learning, not only because there has been opposition to them and sometimes even revolt against them, but because seemingly immutable truths about the educational process are suddenly being questioned seriously. Even a few examples of matters open to question make this new pattern clear, or at least clearer than ever before.

One of these, the interruption of study during the formal years of education, was until recently considered unfortunate; indeed, it even had a certain stigma attached to it. Now there are second thoughts about this. There is a body of evidence to indicate that in many cases and under certain circumstances such interruptions are beneficial rather than harmful. They add a maturing dimension that can have great and enduring value. And there is a wide variety of possibilities for worthwhile interruptions.

Residential requirements of the most rigid sort were once invariably part of the degree-granting pattern. Life in the residence hall was unquestioned as an educational advantage. But now we are not quite so certain, even though we have a good deal of nostalgia about such a life style. All sorts of new forces have entered the picture, physical, psychological, social. And so we do not adhere quite so steadfastly to the proposition that residence on campus is philosophically or educationally unchallengeable in every case. We have doubts, and these doubts are leading us to different and less traditional concepts about the values of campus residences, the kinds of institutions that need them, and the kinds of students who would benefit from inhabiting them.

Conventional subject matter and conventional instructional methods are areas similarly feeling the pressures generated by those

who rebel against their time-honored inflexibility. In both instances non-traditional study offers new attractions. It can move more readily into less compartmentalized explorations of knowledge and more broadly recognized movements of human change and growth. It can speed up, intensify, and be more relevant to today's learning process by using all the new electronic and other forms of instruction either already in being or contemplated. Whether all these changes in subject matter and method represent attractions or distractions is still the basis for considerable debate in educational circles, but everyone would probably agree that their impact is being felt in no small way.

Consideration of work experience as a component of education is still another aspect of the pattern of flexibility. There are two types to be identified: first, work and study as a regular curricular approach in college or university; and second, recognition of certain kinds of experience as being educationally valuable and therefore worthy of credit toward a degree. The former is a well-accepted academic adaptation presently being used, with variations in its details, by a few hundred of our higher educational institutions; the latter is much less prevalent as an accepted concept or as an accepted part of the degree-granting process. Some proponents of non-traditional education are calling new attention to this concept and are urging that it be part of the total flexible pattern, assuming, of course, that such work experience would require careful evaluation before academic credits were given.

Another effort toward flexibility can be seen in the new or expanded educational roles being assumed by business, industry, labor unions, cultural, governmental, and social agencies, military commands, proprietary schools, correspondence institutes, and others. Together they form the sort of parallel educational system I mentioned earlier, a system thus far having very little contact with traditional institutions, and, through its individual parts, pressing for degree-granting authority. This lack of contact could very easily lead to duplicative and wasteful activities on the part of every institution or agency, traditional or non-traditional. One thing is certain: a parallel system is bound to affect the traditional establishment in many ways, some that could be to the latter's advantage and some that in specific instances could destroy it. But at this point there is not even an adequate awareness by traditional educators and administrators that such a huge potential competitor exists.

"One of the most overlooked but powerful facts of our time is that we have come to a stage in our educational development where a good deal of what man learns, or can learn, is not a part of the formal educational system at all. . . .

"Americans are in an almost continuous state of perceiving, viewing all kinds of television programs many hours each week, reading books and periodicals of all kinds by the billions each year, buying millions of dollars worth of phonograph records and tapes, being bombarded day and night with impressions and messages. . . . Businesses, industrial corporations, unions, and the military carry on a vast number of training programs of their own.

"For example, firms like General Electric and IBM now spend as much annually on training and education as all but the largest universities. Bell Telephone provides as much advanced instruction in applied mathematics and electronic engineering as does any American university. The Department of Defense annually spends as much on training and education as is spent by our fifty states combined. Among other enterprises, it runs more than three hundred military schools, trains nearly half the nation's electronic technicians, has pioneered in the teaching for foreign languages and instructional technology, and actually runs the nation's ninth largest school system — for the children of military personnel overseas. . . .

"The contemporary university now runs the danger of being replaced in what it always thought was one of its most important functions, that of imparting information. Here it may be in a losing battle with the media and the other outsiders, since it is not so deeply motivated as are the business, military, or the corporate organizations in searching for new avenues of profit, superiority, and status.

"Accordingly, we now observe a new phenomenon of educational life. We see publishing houses, electronics industries, commercial film makers, and others entering the field of knowledge dissemination competitively. Furthermore, we see them doing this occasionally with more skill and sophistication, with more of a sense of how learning takes place, than those who have for generations professed to be masters of the learning process."¹

The final aspect of flexibility as a pattern is that of individualized learning. There are two elements in this: individualized opportunity, whereby each student searches for the kind of education suitable and

necessary for himself; and individualized responsibility, whereby each student, having decided on his educational goal and course of action, documents his motivation by satisfactory progress toward his goal. Our more traditional institutions do little, or at least not enough, to encourage this individualized approach. As a result they are sometimes populated to a considerable degree by students who have no appropriate reasons for being there while others are being rejected. Too many students are content to give themselves over to long-established classroom routines or subject matter because their reasons for attending are not particularly educational. Present high rates of attrition show clearly how often students are ill-chosen and ill-matched to the institutions they inhabit and how we are wasting our financial resources and misjudging our human ones.

If flexibility is a major necessity for non-traditional study, then individualized learning is the most important component of that necessity. It is an enormous step forward in breaking all sorts of lock-steps and in establishing for each person a set of educational directions that can take him where he, himself, needs to go. It has many implications that are still rather mysterious, whether one thinks of selection, guidance, study patterns, rewards, or financial requirements both for the student and the institution. Without individualized learning non-traditional study becomes no more than a shadow of what it might be.

To speak of a shadow is to be reminded that much more than the shadow of a doubt hovers over non-traditional forms of education. There is doubt of considerable magnitude and in many quarters about the philosophical rightness, the validity, and especially the educational efficacy of such forms. The greatest doubt of all, a doubt coupled with outright disbelief, is centered on whether a set of patterns for non-traditional study can be created that will guarantee high quality in education rather than dilute it. The terms "external degree" or "individualized learning" or "patterns of flexibility" have a suspiciously permissive ring, especially in the ears of traditionalist educators and a host of laymen as well, who consider current philosophies and practices of college and universities already too much liberalized and weakened. They hear these terms and others, and they are convinced that every vestige of intellectual rigor will disappear into oblivion if the non-traditionalists gain any significant control of higher education. They sense a further proliferation of degree-granting under dubious auspices and with dubious requirements; individualized learning they interpret

to be or to become individualized isolation, especially from faculty; and flexibility they look upon as no more than a synonym for escape from regulation and responsibility.

These doubts and fears are sometimes justified and sometimes not. But they will continue to exist and flourish unless and until non-traditional education develops a set of patterns specifically designed to counteract them. If some order is to emerge out of today's efforts — most of them well-intentioned, a certain number of them effective in and of themselves, practically all of them unilateral in concept and therefore limited — if we are not to have confusion verging on chaos as everyone proceeds in his own non-traditional fashion, if quality is indeed to be protected, then some very specific needs become apparent. Mainly these center about three areas of concern: evaluation of individual capability and recognition of achievement; evaluation and accreditation of programs wherever they are created and promulgated; and safeguards for the protection and encouragement of human academic relationships in the midst of independent and often isolated circumstances of study.

The Commission has only begun to ponder over these necessities, but it already sees certain kinds of new agencies, preferably independent of government, as the major means toward such evaluation and guidance, accreditation of programs, and recognition of individual achievement. It sees also the need for construction of curricula that join non-traditional methods with regular student-faculty relationships, undoubtedly of a new type but more than ever essential. It sees all this with a lack of clarity as yet. And it recognizes that until some plans can be formulated that tie many institutions and agencies together in a sharing of responsibility, much of what happens from now on will be duplicative, financially and educationally wasteful, and sometimes even dangerous to the future of higher education.

Similarly, the final set of patterns to be created is no more than a combination of unsolved problems just now. It will continue to be until some major research is undertaken. This relates to the ways non-traditional study will be financed, what its costs are likely to be, whether these costs indicate paths to more economical or more expensive operation, what role the federal, state, or local governments may be expected to play as well as private foundations, what special effects there may be on private colleges and universities — a series of unanswered questions and issues that must soon be probed and about which conclusions must be reached. Models of non-traditional study

now in operation will offer clues, but few models have been in being long enough to give us more than anecdotal knowledge. And it is too early even to make a guess as to whether any or some or all of the unorthodox approaches to higher education will be helpful in easing today's stringent financial circumstances.

Obviously, there are financial implications in every aspect of non-traditional study. This realization must have been running through your minds while I have been describing some of its broader characteristics. It stands to reason that none of the changes now being sought will be achieved without considerable initial outlays of funds followed by annual recurring costs. The real question is whether in the long run the costs of accommodating to the needs and desires of a vastly greater number of people of all ages and walks of life will be lower through non-traditional methods than they would be if we merely expanded our present patterns.

This is a question about which we have some theories but insufficient data for an adequate answer. And the fact that the data are insufficient should be of particular concern to you who as presidents or deans or faculty members carry the burden of accounting for the financial stability of your institutions. You are probably more aware of and more sensitive to the paradoxical moods of the American people these days than are the rest of us who are allied with education. The moods are paradoxical because they reflect a demand for more and more services and at the same time an equally strong demand for cutting back on expenditures. The people literally want to eat their cake and have it. The only solution, even though it is partial at best, is to get more services out of every dollar available to be used. And this is one reason why the possibilities of non-traditional study are suddenly so appealing. They give the impression that high quality education, offered in somewhat unorthodox ways, can be achieved with less operational cost and with fewer capital demands. The impressions may well be true but they need to be documented.

What we require first of all, therefore, is some major efforts in research on the financial side. Bits and pieces have been gathered, but no full-scale effort has yet been attempted. Nor have even the bits and pieces been studied carefully to see what they might mean if applied on a broader scale. I could tell you, for example, of a non-traditional course in introductory economics developed at the State University of New York in which the cost per student was five dollars instead of thirty-five when the material was covered in more traditional ways. Or I

could point to a television course in astronomy which made unnecessary the adding of three new faculty members to a department on a single campus. These are valid illustrations in and of themselves but they are miniscule. How many other courses can be so reconstructed? How many other departments can employ the same or other techniques to bring about economies? As yet, we do not know. But it would not be too difficult to find out.

I can suggest a whole series of components of non-traditional study awaiting examination in terms of costs. Full opportunity means new populations of students of all ages. How are their educational needs to be supported? By federal or state funds? By the students themselves? Is there to be a division of financial responsibility? New populations require a more individualized and more sophisticated process of guidance and counseling, new evaluating agencies or information centers, new arrangements among existing institutions. What will all this cost to create and maintain?

New arrangements of existing subject matter and new subject matter itself form another component to be explored. It may be advisable to create modules of subject matter rather than full courses, modules that can be used more flexibly and interchangeably. What costs are involved in fashioning such modules, in revising them, in getting institutions to use them?

The use of different delivery systems for education requires specific data about what it will cost to provide and maintain equipment, types of special professionals, involvement of faculty, and the pricing out of a host of other details. These systems include television, radio, films, cassettes, computers, correspondence courses, work and study arrangements, independent study contracts, to name only some of them. Here we have a complicated set of financial problems ranging from the scale of initial investment to the financial results ultimately to be expected. Portions of the data exist but a great deal does not; they must be gathered and evaluated.

Non-traditional study cannot help but change teaching patterns and, therefore, the methods and content of teacher training. This has implications not only for those preparing to enter the profession but for those already within it. The re-casting of teacher education will be extremely difficult from an academic standpoint; it will be at least equally so in terms of the resources necessary. Not too much has been said or done thus far in recognizing this need, but it should not be forgotten when one is considering costs.

The learning process itself is due for careful re-examination, as I pointed out earlier. Technological progress has changed not only the ways we live but the ways we acquire knowledge and develop judgments. Non-traditional study meets this issue head on, but not enough is yet known to give such study the acceptance it deserves and requires. Here again is an area where research funds will be needed in sizeable amounts and at all levels of education to discover what new techniques are appropriate for students to acquire.

A wide variety of non-traditional models of education is now either in being or is being planned. These models range from the Open University in Great Britain to such developments as the University Without Walls, The Empire State College, other combinations leading to the external degree, and even the involvement of business and industry in offering courses that can be used for degree credit. Once again, as in other areas of non-traditional study, we have only partial information on costs.

It should be remembered that the two fundamental elements of the non-traditional approach are flexibility and individualized opportunity. Both of these are highly desirable, assuming that the quality of learning is maintained and even enhanced through the application of such elements. Much emphasis has been placed on the first, especially by those outside the academic world who see great potential savings therefrom. Educators are at least equally intrigued by the second, which could do so much to combat the present trend toward depersonalizing education. Whether it would be less or more expensive to opt for individualized opportunity is now known, as yet. The answer probably depends upon the degree of ingenuity with which individualized programs can be devised and directed. My point today is simply that there are financial unknowns still to be explored.

There are still other aspects of non-traditional study with financial implications. There is, for example, the possibility of interchange of materials and personnel between institutions which could avoid needless duplication and effect economies. There is also the possibility of interchange and other forms of cooperation between academic institutions and business, industry, labor unions, cultural and social agencies, and others, many of which are already offering educational programs independently at present. There is the seemingly simple process of developing communications nationally by regular distribution of information on new and promising developments, information so necessary to intelligent planning. Who will do this and

what resources will be required are matters yet to be determined.

Even though I have offered merely a listing of the many areas where much remains to be discovered and where money will be required, I think the point is clear. There will be new and different sorts of outlays of significant size. And another point that should be clear by now is that the movement toward non-traditional study will relate not only to the new population segments I identified earlier but will also affect the patterns of learning in our traditional institutions. This latter development may be complicated but it will unquestionably have financial repercussions, very likely of a favorable nature.

What I have been describing to you is not a projection of what may happen. It is a prediction of what will happen. The pressure of the American people toward full educational opportunity is strong and will become stronger. We shall not be able to ignore it whatever our personal predilections may be. If such opportunity is provided with assurances of quality, with the opening of more options for the student, and with due regard for his individual needs and aspirations, the present traditional system of higher education will be transformed — not replaced, but transformed. It will be a transformation by addition as well as by substitution. And this will mean that we shall have to find new and ingenious ways to pay for the system that ultimately emerges.

By now, as I conclude, you may be wondering why you have been subjected to this exposition of non-traditional study that raises many issues and settles none. I have done so because, first of all, I believe that you will hear much about these issues again from many sources including your own institutions. And you will not merely hear about them; you will have a decision-making responsibility in regard to a good many of them. You may even discover that higher education, in which you have justifiable pride and a great investment in energy and loyalty, will soon begin to change many of its characteristics with more rapidity than you might have thought possible. Whether this will thrill or horrify you depends, naturally, on your own personal educational philosophy and that of your college and university.

There are a few things you can be certain about, however, even now while such confusion is evident. Non-traditional study will continue to develop and grow in this country whether or not it is carefully planned with appropriate evaluations and safeguards to qualify. A great number of the American people want it; they will search for where they can find it; they will apply great pressures to bring it into being where it does not yet exist. There is no blinking at

this fact; it is the first reality the Commission discovered.

Another reality is that while so little that is as yet definitive is known about non-traditional study, a great body of mythology or folklore is emerging about it. Some of this is positive, some negative. But it grows and grows, sometimes making this new form of education the answer to all of education's problems but just as frequently making it the object of suspicion or even condemnation. And this condition will continue until experience and research relating to that experience substitutes knowledge supported by data for wishful thinking influenced by prejudice.

The only other reality I can offer at this time is that so long as this nation continues to be a republic and fosters democratic ideals, the philosophy of full educational opportunity will spread and grow stronger. There will still be islands of elitism here and there, not as many as there once were, but there will be some. The main thrust, however, is already clearly evident. It is toward total, lifelong opportunity with educational options in number and variety for the individual such as we of older generations never dreamed or dared to hope for.

Reference

1. Gould, Samuel B., Today's Academic Condition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1970, pp. 43-46.

Discussion

Dr. Gould: I know but that's got to be built into the thing. No one's going to support them indefinitely except as you create a program within your institution in which these new things take the place of some other things that you've been spending money on.

You don't have to take your whole institution and turn it into a non-traditional program, but you can select things that you feel that you would like to do of a non-traditional nature which can be done possibly less expensively than what you did before. The problem comes that a lot of institutions that want to get in non-traditional studies want to do everything in addition to what they are already doing. They say, "We want to keep everything we've got right now. We want to keep all

the departments, all the courses, all the programs and we'll put this in as a kind of alternative." Well, this is costly, and you can't do it very long and go on.

But I could give you any number of examples like Empire State College, university without walls, has been given—I don't know what the total sum is, but it is well over a million dollars to support its programs. Whether these will all prove out, I don't know.

What I'm saying is: If you can come up with a program that shows promise, foundations today will listen because the foundations are interested in these new approaches. You see, for years foundations have put their money into higher education, and they have not seen a great deal come out of it. They are now saying, "What happened to all these millions that we poured in. We don't see anything occurring except great editorials and criticisms about colleges and universities in the newspaper, and we see a lowering of the general support by legislators, bond issues being voted down steadily all over the country. We must have been putting our money in the wrong things."

Now they say, "Tell us what to put our money into that will make higher education a more valuable kind of institution." And I think they are in a position now where the possibilities of offering them programs that have promise will be supported. And I wouldn't hesitate in the slightest, but I do caution that you cannot expect to build a program in non-traditional study and simply superimpose it on everything else that you've got without having the whole thing break down.

Dr. Gould: I think that's very interesting, and I think probably if you proceed with that, you'll be more and more confident about the ability of students to teach other students. This is really fairly well-known, but it has to be experienced in every single institution before it's accepted. And there's a great significance to that. Now, I don't mean that you can replace the faculty with students, but I do mean there are a lot of areas of activity in which the faculty member is really superfluous, and the student can handle it in one way or another, either as you described, or sometimes in an entirely different way.

If there were time, I could describe for you a most interesting experiment carried on at the Brockport campus of the University of New York having to do with the biological sciences where they did some fantastic things in the combination of elements. This was in the laboratory where they were able to do away with all of the faculty supervision. Everything went along just beautifully and the results were as good or better and the costs were around half the amount or less.

There are a lot of ingenious possibilities that are based on good educational theory that need to be tested and worked out carefully and most of all need to reach a point of being accepted by people who are timid about these things. There are so many people who have been brought in a tradition of teaching who cannot understand that it is possible for a student to learn by himself, that he doesn't have to be taken by the hand all of the time.

Years ago, when I was a member of a faculty and we instituted this so-called reading course, I said, "I don't care if you never come to class. It's completely unimportant to me. Here's a list of readings. There is the library. This is what I expect you to know. Now, whenever you tell me that you think you have mastered it, I'll be glad to give you an exam and find out whether you know anything about it."

And there was no problem about it. They marched out to the library, checked out the books. They did just as well as the ones who came dutifully three times a week and sat there while I went over the material with them that they should have been able to get themselves. There are better ways for a faculty to spend its time.

This is only a very small illustration. There are countless others. And this all presses in the same directions of the individualized possibility that the student has which can be organized in all types of ways and frequently at much less cost.

You know, at Antioch we used to have so many things going of different sorts that we were able to accommodate four times the number of students that we had beds for on campus because we had independent studies going on off in one direction; we had study abroad with students off in another; we had the work and study program that took them off for three months at a time. There were 750 beds. We could take care of four times that amount of students. It's pretty good economy. It was damn good education as it happened.

You can do it. It depends on the kind of student, the motivation of that student, the ability of that student to take care of himself, and also it depends upon the quality of the program that you devise in the first place.

Dr. Gould: Well, it's a problem with which I am familiar. I think the State University of New York had probably more dormitories than any other institution in the entire country and was building them at an enormous rate and to deal with them in the way you just described, precisely. These dormitories were supported by the rent paid by the students; and, therefore, they had to be kept full. If they weren't, there

wasn't enough to pay the interest. A pretty dubious approach to a problem, but it was there.

I won't want to say for a minute that the State University of New York has solved this problem because I don't believe it has. All that they have done is to stop building dormitories which is at least one step in the right direction. I do think there are things which can be done.

One of the reasons why students don't want to live in the dormitories is because of the way in which the dormitories are operated. They—It would be possible for example among many married students whom we now have in colleges and universities to recreate these dormitories into what virtually amounts to apartments where they would be much more likely to come and live, and there would be a much more independent situation than some of the others. And I think this could be done at prices which would match what they would get outside and, perhaps, be more convenient for them.

And then there are other things that can be done. We have not gone out of our way in most institutions to do much about making the dormitories something that the student is drawn to because he finds the kind of living that appeals to him. Usually, it is quite the contrary. And so in his rebelliousness against that, he manages sometimes to turn a dormitory into something we won't even try to describe. It's not an easy problem, but I wonder how many institutions faced with this problem have done more than wring their hands about the fact that they can't meet the costs and have re-thought what they might do with these dormitories that they now have on their hands.

Some of them can be converted to classroom use and for other uses, and I think that in some places they already are. This is beginning to happen. You don't get the same kind of revenue, but you can allocate certain revenue out of tuition if you are using something for an academic purpose rather than for a residential purpose. I think it's a great problem for which we are going to pay for a long time to come.

These dormitories were built with 30-year responsibilities attached to them, and I'm positive that very few of these are going to survive for 30 years—I mean in terms of our being able to keep them filled. But I think that this has been a failure on the part of institutions to ever handle a residential system in any realistic or appropriate way.

We talk about realism. I remember my own college days, and the rules and regulations that surrounded our living on the campus were just unbelievable. I went to a good, solid Baptist institution; and you won't believe this, but I was on a committee that had to fight with the

administration and trustees to allow dancing on the campus. You can imagine what kind of dormitory rules we had. We were in a constant state of rebellion. I mean in those days we weren't as open and vocal about it as they are today. We were much more inclined to say, "Well, all right we won't say anything about it. But we hate it." And so we did everything that we weren't supposed to do, and we did it secretly. But we weren't any different.

Generations of students don't really change as much as we think they do. They are open about it today. We were secretive about it. And I think it's much better when they're open about it.

The problem is virtually an albatross around the neck of all the institutions: and, particularly, it is a difficult thing for the private institutions stuck with all these things. Bear in mind, that we are in a situation where the total enrollment in colleges is going to drop by 50% in 1980. And, yet, there are private institutions today that are still campaigning to build new buildings as fast as they can get them built. And they are literally digging their own graves. Those buildings are never going to be filled. I don't care whether they are libraries or anything else because by the time we get this new surge of population, those buildings will be out of date.

As a matter of fact, I wouldn't believe in building a library anywhere today because a new kind of library isn't going to require this kind of building that everybody's building today. We're just not thinking in terms of what the needs for the future are.

I saw a few weeks ago—I happen to be associated with the Encyclopedia Britannica in a vague sort of way. I saw the entire Encyclopedia Britannica, all 24 volumes—I guess it is—on 24 cards that big. (Indicating.) They were all in a little folder, and all you have to do is buy the folder and those 24 little cards, and the cost is less than half of what you now pay for the Encyclopedia Britannica. This hasn't been out on the market yet, but it will be.

Now, this is just a straw in the wind of what's going to happen. What does this mean insofar as libraries are concerned? What are you going to do with all of those stacks? You're not going to need all of those things on the shelves anymore. You're going to be able to put the whole thing into a room that is one-fourth this size. And you're going to get whatever you want and put it into a machine that a student takes home and brings back, and all of that sort of thing. It's a whole new world, and we haven't even begun to think about the implications to satisfy construction of facilities on the campus. Libraries is only one.

Look at the classroom buildings we've built. We're not going to use any of them pretty soon. We're not going to need that kind of classroom building anymore. We're not going to teach this way.

We just have gone along doing what we've always done on some kind of supposition that this is the way that it's always going to be because this is the way it is. And, incidentally, all of these new approaches probably mean an enormous savings—an enormous savings to the student, who is the most important person in this whole thing and to the institution as well.

Now, what I'm really trying to say is: All of us are going to have to start taking the framework away from our thinking that we've always had around us. You know, one of my oldest and dearest beloved friends was Charles H. Kettering, a great inventor, who was a remarkable man. You may have read about him and heard about him.

He's a truly miraculous person in many ways. He was, as I say, a great inventor. The reason he was a great inventor was that he never had any limits in his mind. You see, if you gave him a problem, he never thought only in the conventional ways of solving that problem. His mind ranged.

For example, he once gave me a puzzle to do that simply consisted of nine dots, three dots in a row—nine dots. He said, "Now, you draw a line from any one of these through all the others without taking the pencil off the paper and without crossing the lines."

I puzzled over it, and I puzzled over it: and, of course, it just seemed impossible to do. Now, the reason I couldn't do it was that I was bound by the framework of those nine lines.

He said to me, "Don't you see how stupid you are." He said, "Start from here, but let the first line go way way up, and you can go down and go through two dots at the same time." (Indicating.) Then, when you started thinking in those terms, you found solutions that you never thought of before.

That's what I mean by freeing the mind. We were talking about creativity this afternoon, you remember. We in education have got to start being creative in this way, and we're not. And I maintain—Now, remember, I came out of a private college background. I've been head of a private college, and I've struggled with all the finances of private colleges, and I've struggled with the finances of public ones.

Anyone who tells you that public institutions don't have any financial problems doesn't know what he's talking about. I tell you that there are always creative ways to solve these problems—not just one

person doing it, but there is a reservoir of resources on any campus, I'm sure, that can be tapped to find answers to these questions.

I have a feeling that a faculty approached with a problem that you say is a matter of life and death—"We've got to solve it. Now, let's get to work."—and sit down and work on this, you'll come up with an answer because there's a remarkable amount of ability. And students can do this, too. Sometimes they can do it better than the faculty can do it in certain areas so that there is no occasion for being in a state of despair or alarm.

It's rather, I think, one of the most fascinating periods in education that we've ever had in this country. I think we're turning a great corner. We're going off into a new direction where some marvelous things are going to occur. I don't think it's going to be the prerogative of the public institution to do all of this. I think the private institution is going to have its share, and I think they can do remarkable things. But you have to have a feeling about it when you start, and you can't start scared.

If I had the time to tell you the story of the beginnings of the State University of New York, I'll guarantee that there isn't an institution represented in this room that has had a start and a series of problems that come even close to the difficulty that that institution had just in surviving. You can't do it if there's a sense of fear about it.

We all have the same hours of day; and, therefore, the same amount of time to work and to think. And you have to look at that as time you take a real shot at whatever is that you've got to do, and you don't sit there wringing your hands over it.

I think these private black institutions have got great possibilities because I think you have not even begun to show what you have actually achieved over the years. You haven't proved it. And, therefore, you haven't been able to tell everybody what you've proved; and when you do show what you've done, it may come off that you have actually done more for the individual student in the time you've had him than most of our prestigious institutions have done for the students that they've had. Where you move a student from Point A to Point B from the time he came until the time he left may be a far greater distance intellectually than the student who went to Princeton or the student who went to Harvard for a lot of reasons that you are as familiar with or more familiar with than I am.

But you haven't told your story. First, you haven't proved your story, and then you haven't told it. You haven't told it to the right

people and often enough and over and over and over until everybody knows it.

Once you do that there isn't going to be any question about the value of these institutions. You heard Chuck say this afternoon that there are 300,000 potential students waiting. If we are going to reach a point of parity in this country in the number of black student representation, 300,000 students is a lot of students. It represents, for example, the number of students that are in the State University of New York plus the budget of a half of a million dollars annually just to operate the place.

And I say don't be scared of it. Here's a marvelous opportunity. But it's going to take a lot of people within these institutions, and you people are the key, and I think the key of the whole thing is the faculty. If the faculty would get behind all this, everything moves. I've seen it happen over and over again.

Question: Is that realistic, though—I mean like for younger faculty members or people who are not chief administrators or the presidents to pretend to go to the board or go to the legislatures. No matter how valuable or how important the program, I consider that sort of suicide.

Dr. Gould: It would be suicide if you go to them without some kind of official representation being involved. Sure. I think a young faculty member who goes to a legislator on his own to tell him what he thinks ought to be done about anything is committing suicide. But if he goes as a representative of an institution duly designated by his peers, there's no suicide in that at all. I know a lot of young faculty who have been placed in that position, and it's been the best thing in the world for them and the best thing in the world for the people they have met with.

I think we've got to open up a lot of these doors. And these days, particularly, these chevalier are being challenged and disappearing. You are going to see a lot of things happen to tenure in this country that you never dreamed would happen. I'm not saying that tenure will be abolished, but you're going to see some great changes in tenure in the not too distant future. And this means that all fat cats are going to have to start re-thinking things.

I don't feel that the opportunity to represent the institution from an intellectual standpoint is a matter of seniority at all. I think it's a question of finding the person that's got the ideas and putting him in the forefront where he can present them.

The best presentation that was ever made to the legislature that really saved our bacon one year in terms of our total budget was made not by the administration of the university, not by anybody on the faculty but by a group of ten students who worked with us first for three days developing a plan and an argument and then went to the legislature and met with the chairmen of the committees, and my only role in it was to see that they got a hearing.

They met with the governor. They met with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Finance Committee. I didn't go with them. I stayed home and counted my beads.

The first reaction I got was a telephone call from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. And he said, "You know, I just got through with a meeting with your students." I thought, "Here I go." He said, "I want to tell you something." He said, "I want to tell you what I told them." He said, "I told them that every one of them after they got through college, if they wanted a job in the legislature as an assistant working for some senator or assemblyman, I'd personally see that he got it." He said, "That's how effective I thought those kids were."

It doesn't have to be the chairman of the faculty committee or whatever you call it that is the all-powerful one. I know those committees. I've had my ups and downs with them over the years, and they have their role to play, too. But they can be given other things to do.

When you get to something that's really important, and it represents the future and a change of the tradition, you've got to use people who believe in this and therefore can give that kind of impression when they talk to others about it. You see, in a state university the first person that has to be convinced of what you are doing and how important it is and how exciting it is is the governor of that state. And once he is convinced, the doors open everywhere. And that doesn't happen by calling him up on the phone or sending him a series of letters. It happens by your sitting with him every chance you get and talking all the plans over of the university in the minutest detail until he is so full of it that he's going around making speeches himself about the university. And the reason he will do it and the reason all of the other politicians will do it is that this represents more votes in one place than they can get from any other place in the whole state. And the minute they understand that, they start listening.

There are lots of ways of approaching this, and I'm not trying to say that these are the things to do. I'm simply saying: Examine your

problems in terms of the possibilities you have for change in your institution not in terms of the difficulties that they present—Everything worthwhile has difficulties.

I've never seen a single thing happen on a college or university campus that wasn't fraught with difficulties and sometimes with danger. I've been on a college campus where we didn't know if we had enough money to take care of the payroll the next month. Probably, you have, too—some of you.

Well, you can sit and cry about it. But that isn't going to solve anything. You have to think of new ways to approach the problem. You'd be amazed at what you think of when you have to.

Maybe that's one of our problems. I've often thought that it would be a good idea to call an entire faculty of a college in—I have a particular college in mind—and say to them—And I'm telling you the truth now. This is what you could say to them: The liquid assets of this institution are such that nine months from now this institution will be bankrupt. Now, there's the problem. You sit down now and figure out a way to get it out.

Now, what would you do as a faculty if you were faced with that—go out and look for another job? There isn't another job. This is the kind of thing we haven't been willing to face up to. We don't put a problem in its simplest terms and broadest terms and say, "This is your problem as well as mine. We don't have anymore money. We want to keep the institution going. Let's figure out a way how to do it." It can always be done. That's the interesting thing—if people really want to.

And I think that you in these black colleges, knowing the potential that you have in terms of students and knowing what you can do for those students either in their present numbers or numbers to come, have an opportunity that you should welcome and welcome all of the difficulties that go along with that opportunity.

And I'm not saying this just for rhetoric. I'm saying this because I believe it, and I know it can come to pass.

Now, what you're doing here and what you're going to be doing next summer, I think, are important steps in that process of strengthening institutions that have every right not only to exist but to flourish and to be part of a mainstream of American education.

FACTORS AFFECTING EFFECTIVE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Frederick Humphries

There are two parts to this session. The first part deals with how to create an effective curriculum; and the second part addresses how one gets an effective curriculum installed and accepted. I will address the first part. In addressing this topic, I want to talk about factors affecting effective curriculum development, but in the sense that curriculum development is a marked break with tradition. Students are most put off by teachers who don't care or don't seem to care. Caring is a word like relevance which has been so frequently used by students that it has aroused distrust among faculty members. But one has little reason to distrust the validity of the students' reactions when one has had the chance to pin them down about what they mean by caring. Their reactions are a good deal less personal than many faculty members think. A sensitivity does exist in students for maintaining some difference between faculty and students. Students don't want an arm over the shoulder and let's rap about it in somebody's pad kind of familiarity. What they do want is a teacher able to convey a sense of caring about what he is doing, and somehow make that concern include both students and the world outside the campuses.

One good thing about the small colleges represented by the group present here is that caring should not be a concern. However, let me assure you that caring for students is just as much of a problem in small liberal arts colleges as it is in major universities. The culprit is the universality of the disciplines dominating higher education with the attendant constraints. Students are forced to declare majors in their freshman year. Faculty members' allegiance to subject matter and discipline is about as fierce within small liberal arts colleges as anywhere. Each faculty member is concerned about his place in his scholarly discipline and the immediate chances for advancement if he is young, or completion of his life-long plans if he is old, and his private life away from the classroom.

The very nature of higher education creates barriers between students and professors. These barriers stem not only from the intellect that drives professors, but they also come from an honest objectivity of scholarship, for the necessity to keep personal and subjective elements

from contaminating the truth. The useful distance which forms of address, classroom routine, formal hours, and the like maintain—are widened by the necessity for maintaining scholarly detachment.

Urgings on the part of youth to let it all hang out do not reach a generation of professors schooled in the measured response to any phenomena. These are attitudes which create distance between students and professors.

William Arrowsmith gets to the heart of the matter in the following quote: "I am suggesting what will undoubtedly seem paradox or treason. There is no necessary link between scholarship and education, or between research and culture, and in actual practice scholarship is no longer a significant educational force. Scholars, to be sure, are unprecedentedly powerful, but their power is professional and technocratic. As educators they have been eagerly disqualifying themselves for more than a century, and their disqualification is nearly total. The scholar has disowned the student. That is, the student who is not a potential scholar, and the student has reasonably retaliated by disowning the scholar.

This, I believe, is the only natural reading of what I have to take to be a momentous moment. The decision of the student from the institution of higher learning on the grounds that they no longer educate, and are therefore, in his own word, irrelevant.

By making education the slave of scholarship, the university has renounced its responsibility to human culture and its old proclaimed possess as educator and molder of men an ecumenical function, but has disowned, in short, what teaching has always meant a care and a concern for the future of man, a platonic love of the species, not for what it is, but what it might be. It's a momentous refusal."

These remarks have a specific relationship to the subject at hand, factors affecting effective curriculum development. The influence of researchers is very deeply rooted in all aspects of higher education. If this influence is not recognized and taken into account, curriculum reform will be constrained to attain ends which facilitate the maintenance of the ends of research. Without a conscious rejection of the predominant force in higher education today, no curriculum effort will ever have the potential to develop along different lines, which would begin to offer solutions to the crisis in higher education. In fact, I believe that there cannot be any major upheaval in higher education until the paragon of research is rejected.

Most keen observers of education agree that there is an inherent

conflict between research and education. However, most avoid the problem, either by claiming that education and research are inherently intertwined, or by publicly stating one set of values while adhering to another. What must be understood is that I am not requesting the complete abandonment of research as a force in higher education. I am taking issue with the total encompassing grasp of research. For the most part all four-year institutions have a dominant streak of research running down their backs. If you don't believe that, you need only to ask yourself a simple question and answer it. "Who is the highest paid faculty member on your faculty?" It is not a teacher. It is a person who is doing some research and writing papers. For a second example, you need only to examine the kinds of rewards in the educational system, such as prestige and promotion. Even in small four-year institutions that purport to do teaching and education, it is clear that research is what one gets rewarded for in the educational system.

Some colleges and universities must remain institutions dedicated to research; others must become institutions dedicated to education. I take no issue with the mission which an institution chooses for itself except if the choices all fall with too great a number on the research side. I do, however, take issue with the normal consequences of the choices. Institutions must stand committed to their choices—no backtracking on what they say they are going to be doing in higher education.

The University of Chicago illustrates the point. It is an institution dedicated historically, philosophically, and in practice to the supremacy of research over education at all levels. In 1800 when the University was founded, its first president, William Raney Harper, left no doubt about the mission of the institution. It was to make the work of investigation primary; the work of giving instruction secondary. The faculty would be promoted more largely upon the results of their work as investigators than upon the efficiency of their teaching. Clearly, the narrow discipline specialists and the knowledgeable technocrats would serve this institution well. It is likewise clear that effective curriculum development in this institution would have to be geared toward maximizing student's ability to obtain facts in an effective manner. The typical innovation of the last decade would most aptly apply to these types of institutions.

The problem in higher education is the institution with the mission of education. Presently this mission wreaks havoc and runs counter to our expertise and experiences. College faculties and their

administrations know a great deal about how to get people prepared for graduate and professional schools, and presumably to prepare students for the technical careers. I say presumably because I meet too many young and old people unhappy with their jobs. The day to day repetitiveness of their job collides with the noble search for truth notion, transmitted by four years of learning the facts and structure of a discipline, and the expectation that work, after college, would be a continuation of unraveling the mystery of the disciplines.

The point is that undergraduate education is the graduate club obstacle course. The survivors that finish with distinction can be admitted to the club. The survivors who do not finish with distinction can only take their places in the work world. The result is, for those who don't make it, to look for a job which closely approximates situations expected in graduate school. For industry, it has meant that they must establish training programs for your university's output before they can become useful and effective. There is no such training program at the graduate school level except for students who come out of four-year black undergraduate institutions. Thus, it would appear that an undergraduate education prepares a student adequately only for graduate and professional schools.

So there is a mismatch between the career aspect of higher education and the actual requirements of the careers. It is clear that the graduates of the colleges can, in a short period of time, do the work that's required in industry. The problem is that four years of educational processing creates an attitude in students which does not make for a disposition to do that.

There's another irony in this whole thing, and I will make a comment about that. It's simply this: because of the class/caste system in higher education, major industrial recruiters tend to want to go to the "major" institutions to hire their personnel. The attitude which does not allow a student to adjust to industrial requirements is much more ingrained in a graduate of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton than it is in a graduate of Florida A & M or Alabama A & M. And so it's a kind of a double effect for them. They don't want to hire people from major black colleges, where they stand the best chance of getting students who will do the kind of job they want done. They want to hire the graduates of the Ivy League. So industry gets a double backfire in the whole process. However, that's an attitude that they have to work with in terms of straightening out and becoming effective in their assumed roles.

Major universities know very little about how to educate—now, I'm speaking about education in the noblest sense—and the form of teaching which flows normally from the concept of education as a mission. Ostensibly, if higher education personnel are to be effective in this pursuit, they must be willing to admit their ignorance and lack of expertise. That admission is difficult for any teacher to make under any circumstance.

It is most difficult for those whose lives have been dedicated to college instruction and college practices. Anyone who refuses to make that admission will probably not be very helpful in working out any probable new effective alternatives to education in the sense that education is a driving force to shape the values of man in a humanistic way.

Much of what has been done as an educational innovation will be of no use in facing squarely this issue either. Paul Dressel and Francis H. Delise, reacting to the concern that mass education and the proliferation of specialties had destroyed the unity of undergraduate education and had replaced the spirits of inquiry in the search for abiding values with the passive effects of acquiring skills, set out in 1957 to document the range and frequency of prevailing practices at a national level for a representative sample of institutions in higher education—the institutions were selected from the 1964 edition of the American Council on Education's American Universities and Colleges. The random sample was representative of all types of institutions.

The study was from 1957 to 1967. The authors, after carefully analyzing changes made over ten years with respect to: a) basic and general education, b) major concentration, c) elective options, d) use of individualized and integrated experiences, and e) comprehensive patterns and unusual varieties, concluded that despite all the talk about innovation, undergraduate curriculum requirements as a whole had changed remarkably little in ten years. In many cases the only thing that could be said about a particular institution was that its curriculum had been renovated; that is, requirements were restated in terms of new kinds of organization and course offerings, and updated to recognize the rights of new disciplines to a place in the sun.

In many respects, higher education can be equated with the state of science at the turn of the century. In the last part of the 19th century in the scientific community there was a peace. All of the formulae and all of the theories had been worked out. There were a few problems on the horizon, but nobody was really concerned. What one

felt was that what had been developed as a discipline—the formulae, the theories—had the inherent capability to solve these problems. All that one had to do was subject the new phenomena which were occurring to those theories and to the structure of the discipline and the answer would come.

But in the latter part of the 19th century and the early 20th century, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse appeared on the scene of science. The first was blackbody radiation phenomenon. Scientists couldn't explain or derive formulae which could give quantitative reproduction for what was observed when they put some coal in a stove and got a red radiation from it, and then if they added more coal, it would turn white. The emissive power represented by the color changes coming from an old coal stove that you got heated by in your old classrooms, presented scientists at the turn of the century with a problem that they could not solve.

Max Planck came along and proposed that energy was discontinuous, and in making that proposal he then was able to solve the riddle of blackbody radiation. In 1905 Einstein discovered photo-ionization. It was observed that below a certain frequency, light electrons would not be ejected from a given metal. Each metal had its own characteristic frequency. A requirement to solve that puzzle was that energy had to be viewed as discontinuous. The resolution of these phenomena was very disconcerting. The scientific community believed that everything was deterministic in our society. If it knew all of the input factors, it could determine future action.

However, once one admits that energy is discontinuous, there is a necessary concomitant consequence that follows—one cannot predict the future with any certainty. One can only predict the future with a certain amount of certainty. There is always an indisputable amount of uncertainty. Needless to say, the scientific community was placed in complete disarray.

So what scientists have been engaged in since the 1900's up until now has been the derivation of a new theory to deal with the new phenomena which appeared on the scientific scene between 1900 and 1925.

The status of higher education is very analogous to the scientific situation at the turn of the century. There are some problems occurring in higher education. One such problem is that we are not able to effectively educate black people. The old educational system which had it all worked out, when colleges used to get the top ten percent of high

school graduates and when equality of educational opportunity was not a problem in the society, cannot handle the new phenomena now impinging upon higher education. The new perturbances appear to require new assumptions.

What is needed, then, is a new theory of education. Just as new scientific phenomena called for the abandonment in the scientific world of the classical theory of nature and the adoption of the quantum theory of nature, it appears that higher education has to move from the discipline approach to higher education and begin to formulate a new theory of higher education. That new theory—I don't know what it should be, but I think that we must admit that the old classical theory of education doesn't work any longer and that we have to be about the business of discovering what the new theory of education is. The program that I want to talk about is a beginning in that direction.

A primary condition for educators to start is that they must be willing to give up their allegiance to the disciplines. An allegiance to the disciplines precludes crossing departmental lines, insightful examination of content, forging of new teaching styles, or just plain finding new solutions. We have to be willing to try. In 1967 when the Thirteen College Curriculum Program was started as an experiment there were a lot of factors that we knew that were not being considered in drawing up educational programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged students. It is useful to discuss these factors because they can give us some insight into what we ought to do to establish the new theory of education.

Remediation as an approach to solving the problems of those people who had been miseducated, disadvantaged, or whatever you want to call it, was not a workable solution. Yet society seemed to insist that more of the same was the answer. So, consciously, in 1966, we rejected remediation, or any form of it, as a viable solution to educating disadvantaged youth.

The second was the need for an honest analysis of the institution—the kind of student population they serve and attracted, the kinds of students they will most likely serve in the future, and the kind of educational commitment they wanted to make to those students. The simple fact was that most institutions were caught up in imitative modes, which undercut the development of new perspectives in education and precluded a rejection of standard prescriptive pattern of curriculum offering. Every institution seeks excellence, but it is an excellence narrowly defined by the standards of the Harvards, Yales, and Princetons.

We agreed that the lone and elusive goal of excellence might be more easily obtained by the rejection of standard higher education models of excellence, and in lieu of it an education curriculum which most appropriately speaks to the student needs of a particular institution. What every institution ought to seek is its own excellence. We know that there is an inescapable reality in higher education; and that is, an enormous variation exists among institutions of higher education in this country, just as there was an enormous variation in the secondary and elementary schools in our country.

Further, the day of the Skinnerian student is still eons away, if ever attainable. And what I mean by the Skinnerian student is simply this: Skinner has proposed that all you have to do if you believe in response to stimuli is that you set the conditions that you want to achieve for human beings, subject them to negative reinforcement and positive reinforcement through stimuli, and you can get people to the same level of standard behavior. Conceivably, then, you can define what kind of standard student you want for college and obtain that product through application of Skinnerian techniques. If Skinner is correct, then one day in this country we can have an equal student input into all educational institutions. However, that day is not here, and it is still eons away, if it is ever attainable. Thus, for the immediate future, all higher educational institutions cannot hope for the characteristics of students in the standard top ten percentile of his class—the top ten percent on college boards—to enter their institution. Such are exercises in futility.

The third factor considered was that the black student who entered black colleges had different characteristics and backgrounds than a normal college student. They were mostly poor; wanted an education not just to earn money, but to change the world; believed that they were competent and that their abilities were equal to those of anybody. They felt that they had the general intelligence of the average person that went to college. They felt that they were reliable and responsible. They felt confident in English and social science. They didn't feel confident in mathematics and in the sciences. They felt that science was difficult for them. A typical expression when I was an undergraduate student was, if you majored in science, "Man, you are a heavy dude." It was precisely that mythology that kept a lot of students out of the science areas. Science was beyond the normal ability of an average entering student. This problem had to be dealt with.

We also knew that the society was racist and that black students were affected negatively by it. It is completely farcical to think that at the tender age of eighteen that students are able to deal with the complexities of racism and understand what that has meant to their lives, how it is affecting them, and how they can positively deal with themselves and other human beings without hatred. Astute individuals appeared to have made the decision that normal entering college freshmen at eighteen years old, who were black and victims of racism could handle it. What I'm simply saying is that black kids come to college; they know they come from a racist society; and they are looking for some help. If colleges don't do something about it, they neglect their responsibility.

We also knew that black kids came into college with academic achievement scores far less than those who populated normal college campuses throughout the system.

In 1966 the faculty was caught in the discipline and research syndrome. The way to improve the college was to recruit better students and select more sophisticated textbooks and write scholarly papers in your fields. The administration was saying that despite the fifteen contact hours that faculty had to teach, they still had to write papers. In the sciences it was fifteen to twenty-four contact hours. Despite that, the administration still insisted if you want to get promoted, papers had to be published. Everybody responded, yeah, yeah, yeah, we've got to write papers. The faculty requested of the administration that they make their institution more like the white institutions. Reduce the teaching load and then we'll write the papers. So in 1966, it was fairly true across these institutions that everybody had the same syndrome as was pervading all of our education—We've got to get the scholarly research out. Working at being a good teacher was taboo.

It was against this background, institutions not perceiving they should be in control of their destiny, but largely imitating major white institutions for their curriculum; characteristics of students which did not have impedance matching requirements with the undergraduate curriculum; and the faculty having no inclination to be educators. As always, in any generalizations, there are exceptions to the rule. I recognize that, and I hope you recognize that too. But the pervasive attitude in higher education is exactly as I have specified. It was against that background that Sam Proctor, then president of ISE, called to Newton, Massachusetts, fourteen college presidents and suggested that

they turn education around, reject the modality of remediation and begin to initiate construct programs that would address needs of their students. Of the fourteen colleges that came, thirteen agreed that they would try. It was a single significant act. Those presidents agreed that they would turn over the education of a significant part of their student body to a group, ISE, not knowing exactly what the program was or what the kind of materials were going to be in the program or if there were going to be any kind of relationship between the disciplines or what the teachers were going to be doing in the classrooms. They agreed to give academic credit to the students who would take the program and assured ISE that if students performed the program successfully, that academic credits received would count toward graduation. That single decision was the beginning of a revolution in higher education and the beginning of a new theory of education. I might say that if we had paid attention to this a long time ago that maybe non-traditional study might not be upon us in terms of the relevance in educational institutions.

As a result of the decision to participate by these institutions, the program was initiated and several objectives were determined. They were simple objectives, and yet they were unusual. Objective one was to reduce the attrition rate in black colleges. We wanted more students to get through college. We wanted to develop an educational program such that more students could be successful in negotiating the higher educational system. Objective two was to instill in the faculty the notion that they could create exciting, new, and different curricular materials. Through the accomplishment of objective two we hoped to establish within an institution the capability for continuous change and a dynamism that would always keep the curriculum at a high level of relevance to the entering students and to academic needs of entering students.

Objective three was to promote institutional change. The normal history of educational experimentation had been people experiment, document it, say it's good, write about it, and then it's put on a shelf. Instead we started with the premise that if we found the program was effective that we were not going to be happy with just that finding, that we were going to institute the small revolution within the colleges. Institutional change is an exciting topic in itself and we have had many anxious hours. Dr. Edward Brantley will speak next on this issue. With these objectives in mind, in the Summer of 1967, at Pine Manor Junior College, we initiated development of a curriculum program across four areas: English—it wasn't called English; it was called Ideas and Their

Expression—mathematics, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

In the derivation of the content of the course, we didn't know—and that's the point I want to make, and that's the point I think that you should take away from what I am about to say—We didn't know exactly what to do, because all that we had learned wasn't applicable to what we were trying to do, but we had some guidelines that we thought we could work with. There was the pre-college experience. That experience dictated that the activities of the classroom should not be in the hands of the teachers, but must be placed in the hands of the students. Students had to interact and be active within the classroom. Why that is so important and so necessary in this particular program can be easily deduced, if one just thinks about it, logically and analytically. The racist society has told us that we can't make right kinds of decisions. We don't get right kinds of answers. It's always a rejection. In the whole act of growing up, the society tells you that you are wrong and someone else is right. Racist behavior inflicts doubt, by the absence of experiences, and destroys rational mental processes by giving illogical responses to both academic and human situations. Constant exposure during the years of youth robs many students of their confidence. Therefore, confidence has to be instilled in students. They cannot get that from listening to teachers all the time. They have to talk, reason, and reach conclusions that are self-derived and in which they can believe. This experience has to occur over and over again for them to develop a sense of positiveness about what they know and what they can do. It is important that the first year of college reflect this need. The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program had to be and was built upon this notion.

Because of the teachers "stick-to-it-iveness" about the discipline, we had to invoke activities which would lead to teacher change. In the early phase of the program everything that we did was focused at the teacher to get him to change his attitudes about what was a classroom. We redefined curriculum. Curriculum became more than content. It became everything that you did in the classroom; it included materials that you dealt with, the shape of the classroom, the size, how you had it fixed up, and the actual teaching style that you use in the classroom. The definition of curriculum was total encompassing, and from that definition a new respect for students and a new teacher stance flowed.

We made some mistakes. We backed off of some things. I don't want to give you the impression that everything worked perfectly and was documented, one, two, three, four. We started with some ideas.

Some were right; some were wrong. Over the years we've had to revise, collect, and keep moving—moving in the direction that we started. As we grew, we learned better to do the things that were necessary. However, out of that process we have evolved the curriculum—a curriculum which now has about fifty units, its own unique teaching style, and a success in dealing with the problems of the students that enter our institutions.

Most curriculum development manuals will state that once you know the objectives, constructing the curriculum becomes an engineering problem. That may well be true. But objectives don't necessarily have to be clear. One can revise objectives as one learns more about what it is that one wishes to do. To give you a specific example, when we started the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program, we wanted to integrate mathematics, biology, and physical science. In the first week of the first summer conference the mathematics people withdrew from that as an idea. What the mathematicians wanted to do in mathematics was tough enough without trying to cross the disciplines. Still out of the first summer conference we emerged with a program in which physics, chemistry, and biology were mixed. By the end of the second year the biologists had withdrawn from the mixed course and only the physicists and chemists stayed together to develop what is now the physical science course. The price asked by the mixed course of the teachers was too high. One was asking that you not only derive a curriculum which threatened the normal concepts in an area, but one was asking specialists to take on another discipline too. The combination of both things was too much.

In retrospect, the important things are the following, which have made for an effective program for us in terms of leading to effective curriculum development. It is one thing to dream of exciting ideas about learning and teaching and another to tell a group of teachers that they can learn about learning. That is, learn how to achieve those ideas. What is needed, then, is a design under which a variety of experiments can be conducted.

The first thing that seems to be important is a critical mass. A good-sized group of teachers is needed to achieve the initial impetus to start a project and to sustain it through the hard work that follows. Teachers work necessarily on teaching problems isolated from their colleagues on the same campus and from teachers facing similar problems on other campuses. At least those teachers who are primarily teaching freshmen are looked down upon by other teachers and

scholars. They are often overworked, bored by the routinism of their jobs. So they seek to escape the instruction. By bringing other teachers in the thirteen college thing makes the work more exciting, creates a new kind of collegueship. Teachers can try out each other's ideas and show results. They can see the financial support given their work and the greater responsibility accorded them to decide for themselves what to teach and how to teach it.

Massing teachers bears on another problem of educational reform: how to disseminate results. Since the teachers come together not just from one college but from a number of colleges, the agreement to share with other institutions are already committed to try out the new ideas, materials, and practices that are developed. A third party seems to be a requirement. These are activities which are not a part of the regular business of colleges that are presently constituted, especially if it's revolutionary.

Now, there are advantages to establishing a third party. Graduate students can take such tasks. The third party is not responsible for the day to day operation of the educational plant. It has greater flexibility and freedom to conduct the business, and it still represents the viewpoint of the recipient of the funds rather than the granting agencies. ISE feels the rule of third party in the thirteen colleges approach—besides taking the task of bringing teachers together, ISE develops educational ideas, arranges meetings, negotiates with colleges, negotiates with funding agencies, manages a summer workshop, manages a complicated multi-institutional and multi-agency, programs in the field, and encourages participants to improve them, to spin off their own ideas for future additional efforts.

These things will be important. An important factor for a revolutionary idea is a college within a college. There might be an experiment in science, grants for more equipment, extracurricular and counseling efforts, but the components are not put together in a coherent fashion. How is a group to work simultaneously in a number of elements and the work still kept manageable? The college within a college is an answer. An internal college has all the elements but is too big and unwieldy to approach the broad side.

A small separate group of students and teachers within the curriculum with a sense of responsibility can encompass a great variety of elements in teaching, but on a reduced scale. Once established, a college within a college can seek to establish this influence beyond its initial confines. A variety of means can be used to interest other

students, teachers, and administrators in the projects, special demonstration, classrooms open to visitors, display of new materials, statistics of achievement tests, testimonies from students, subsequent performance of programmed students in regular classrooms.

A fifth important idea seems to be a group of colleges work together, a consortium. Colleges exist as entities separated from each other. Some are public institutions; others are private institutions—a group of teachers from a variety of institutions to establish colleges within colleges, and that requires prior agreement among the institutions themselves. A basic part of this strategy of developing alternative practices is a consortium of colleges.

Grouping of teachers enables teachers to work together and lend each other mutual support by working against established practices. The same group of colleges in the consortium enables other people in the college community to share ideas and provide each other with mutual support.

A college president at a given college who doesn't want to use it because something is different, they can point to other campuses engaged in similar undertakings. Students on a given campus concerned about the acceptability of their new studies to graduate school, and the future employees can gain confidence from the fact that students and teachers on other campuses are also engaged in such alternative approaches.

Ultimately, of course, the strategy is that as new models prove successful, this curriculum will also change and be more varied.

A sixth kind of a factor seems to be summer conferences. The teachers and administrators and counselors need to get together for extended periods of time to rethink and rework what they are doing. But how is this arranged? Teachers need to be free of the immediate pressure of daily teaching, and the more distant pressure of preparing real "stuff" for real classrooms. The academic year with its long summer vacation is ready-made for this need. Since the start of the Thirteen College Curriculum Program, ISE has had a summer conference for these teachers every year. These conferences last from six to eight weeks. Participants work in small groups in special areas and constantly meet with participants in other areas at meals and other informal occasions, and for specially planned presentations.

Management of a conference includes management of libraries, equipment, providing room and board for the participants, preparing the agenda, and recruiting consultants. Teachers begin with useful time

in teaching and just devoting their trials to innovation and experiment—or it would already then be locked into established practices with no opportunity to achieve the necessary distance.

A seventh factor seems to be first years first. There is a pervasive temptation in education to start with the later years and then move to the earlier years. In past years curriculum reform started with the high schools, and then moved to the elementary schools and preschools. In higher education the first impulse was to be changing social and technological institution was to attack all post-graduate work, then rework and rethink freshman studies.

The Thirteen College approach starts with the freshman year. The students are not to drop out during this or later years—Here is where the effort to retain them begins. The students who come to college—we wish them to continue their education, but are poorly prepared. This is where the problems of education must be faced. General practice at present is to view the freshmen and sophomore courses primarily as preparation for the upper level courses.

The Thirteen College approach sees improvement on these levels tied to immediate needs. The curriculum requirements are the leading ideas and are designed to meet those needs. It may be that the upper level courses and the definition of majors also need reforming. This undertaking should be based on the initial work at the freshman and sophomore levels following the natural consequences of students going through college. New things in later years can be made possible on the basis of the new accomplishments in earlier years.

An eighth thing seems to be important: exportable curricular units. The task of teachers at the summer conference is not merely to talk about alternatives to present practices in education, but to start creating the alternatives: the selections of books and new equipment, the activities, the tests, the tapes, the films, the teacher guides. Teachers get together to work on actual "stuff" to be taught and to be tried out. Objectives are the find after the fact, not before. Teachers define what has been accomplished rather than spend time on abstraction about what to do. They plunge right in on the basis of intuition.

Development of new course materials and practices poses its own questions of method and strategy. To start with an entire course can be overwhelming, and teachers are looking around for other things to try. The Thirteen College approach has concentrated initially on developing more manageable units—that may last for a few days or a month or so. Small groups of teachers develop units—groups working independently

on different units but under the same block of units have been put together for a close approximation to a course. More units are developed than any one teacher can use, and each makes his own decision.

As experience accumulates, some units are developed further, and others are dropped. Finally there is a program that has had the initial development area. It can be made available to commercial publication but perhaps still as units.

A ninth factor seems to be yearly cycles. Experimental work is built on the idea of trying out new ideas, getting feedback, making revisions, and trying things again. A year constitutes a natural cycle for such work: invention during the summer, try-out during the academic year, revision in the following summer, and new ideas introduced, further try-out the next academic year. And in a yearly cycle not only does this year's freshman program build on last year's freshman program, but for a given generation, students may work at a sophomore level is made possible in the previous year for those students at the freshman level. This process can take place for five years before materials are made available though, through publications and demonstrations to teachers in colleges outside the initial group influence of the college within a college. It also advances year by year. Local programs try to involve chairmen of departments, et cetera.

The tenth thing that seems to be an important factor in causing a revolution is teachers teaching teachers. Teachers from colleges entered the program with various views. Some are firmly convinced that everything is fine. All that is needed is a better class of students. With such teachers the program has little effect. Other teachers are convinced that learning needs to be made more active for students. The second group finds appropriate what to do—what they are already trying.

Most teachers are the third kind, however. They are dissatisfied with the present teaching and present results, but are unsure trying new things. It's with the third group that the Thirteen College Approach is most effective.

The ICE staff and summer conference begins by demonstrating previously developed units. Experienced teachers begin by demonstrating previously developed units, topics, materials and practices, using for demonstrations either small groups of students or teachers themselves as students.

Then the staff may seek to engage student teachers in developing their own units. Initially, all that is required with teachers is the

willingness to try something new. We finally convince the teachers, however, of the value of the approaches of their own experiences the next academic year in their own classes. Finally, as one teacher puts it, "that the students' lips have become unglued."

Most teachers prefer responsiveness to passiveness. A chief requirement of teachers of teachers, whether the ISE staff or the teachers in colleges assume this relates to ability both to develop new models of education and to demonstrate the new ideas. It is not enough to offer exciting outlines. To talk about teaching, one must be able to work out the details and to do them in front of or with other teachers, and one must gain from teachers that commitment to develop new approaches themselves.

And the eleventh thing is doing your own thing. There is a tension in educational reform between necessity on one hand for teachers to build on the experience of previous experimental efforts and the necessity on the other hand for a teacher to develop that curriculum. It cannot be undertaken somewhere else by superior beings and the results simply piped to the teachers. That puts the teachers in a passive position, and often they simply will not use the materials handed out. Teachers develop deeper commitment, try harder in the classroom to make an idea work when they themselves have helped develop it.

There is another reason why reform—that one must do more than simply adopt the results achieved in another place. A program as a whole—but it can have limitations as well as its successes. This despite the objective of trying a variety of elements and retaining only those that prove successful, for the limitations can be in the basic design. If new failings are not to be explored along with new achievements, any new teacher or new college, or new consortium of colleges must be built further on any program he or it or they seek to use.

That nearly finishes my part about factors affecting effective curriculum development. There is one more point that I want to make which has to do with some of the things that I heard in the conference. I just want to say this from my perspective while I've got you all locked up out there—It seems to me questions have been raised in this conference about the education of blacks on white campuses and the education of blacks on black campuses. Now, what I like to do is call to your attention two things. One item is that creating a revolution and constructing a new theory of education wherein teachers teach, and that teaching becomes an important activity in our educational programs, is not just relevant for black institutions, but it has relevance

for all higher education.

Second item—I disagree vehemently with the notion that materials that are constructed by blacks, for black students is not good for white students. Basically, I disagree with that as a point of view or point of operation. Logically, if one thinks about this, up until now all students have been exposed to a Western-based curriculum. What then is wrong with a little bit of the opposite? An American-based curriculum. I think that there is a myth in our society which negates the fact that it is very clear to both blacks and whites that the black experience is much more beyond the confines of the black community. It's not uncommon to hear, "Right on," in television commercials, or to see it pervasively used throughout the society.

It's not uncommon to see white people giving the black power symbol in airports and places of amusement all over the country. Today in our society, if you live in the suburbs and live in middle town America, you can see that white middle class America and all the urban poor—white, black, and everybody else—are doing all the kind of things that are a part of the American culture, that is influenced by the black experience. The whole language patterns that we are experiencing in this country are coming from the black experience. All of these infused practices are symbolic of something. I think that that something is the sensitivity of the American society to some of its ills.

So I vehemently disagree that a program which focuses on the black experiences should be conceptualized as having no meaning for anybody but black students.

I would like to believe—and I hope it is true, because if it's not true then this society is sicker than I think it is—is that what we are doing in the Thirteen College Curriculum Program and what you will be doing in your colleges as you seek to improve education is not going to be good just for black colleges, but is setting a modality for higher education; period.

I'd like to also make the following point: you don't have to believe all of the things that you've heard in this conference. Most of you know some and I know at least fourteen colleges that have been in renaissance since 1967. I know thirty-six colleges that will be in a renaissance in 1972. I know some other colleges that have been developing programs in the black humanities all across black colleges, so I think we are about the business that we ought to be about. I think we are on target and are doing the things that we should about meaningful education for blacks.

The final point relates to racial polarization. Now, if my life counts for anything, if all the crap that I've gone through to become an educated person means anything, there's one thing of which I'm firmly convinced—It's that there cannot be any racial polarization because of a single factor which my scientific training made clear. We inhabit a world, because of our human frailty, we can't control. You breathe the air. You stand on land.

If my scientific training tells me anything, it is that if you use up the oxygen in America, you are going to use it up in Africa, too. If you deplete the oil resources of this country, you are not just affecting the people in America. You are affecting the people of the world.

If these kinds of consideration are clear, then we had better be at the tables when decisions are made. That can't happen if you are racially polarized. I want to be at the table, when the scientific and technological powers are making decisions about our common earth.

Discussion

Question: I have a kind of a double-barrelled question growing out of this kind of frame of reference with regard to your topic, and that is that this group of people represents so many colleges, and they have met here for the purpose of getting ideas for developing more effective curriculum, or more effective curriculum in their particular institution.

Now, I have been quietly talking with rather—I guess a fairly adequate sample—if not statistically so—of the representatives to this conference, and I get the feeling—and I want you to help me with this—that there are two really basic factors that were not mentioned in your discourse, that is directly, and I want to see if you think, on the basis of your experiences with the Thirteen College Program that I assume to be under the leadership of ISE, if these are really true.

Now, one is—and I don't want to be pedantic about this—that every organization has what we generally call formal and informal relations, or to put it more bluntly in the informal sense, the school has an in-group—It might be the president and his cronies that he brought in, or some senior department head and his cronies he brought in and so forth, and any change you want to make must follow a road that is paved with friction originating from this in-group. Therefore, I would consider that if that is true—I'm just speaking hypothetically now. I'm

just accepting this as hypothesis—that if that is true, then that's an important factor, and I think your experience, I am sure—I would take it as an adequate test of that hypothesis.

Now, the other is a bit more fundamental. It is that a school is a society in miniature. I mean, whether we want to think about it or not, all we are is characterized by a series of interlocking social systems, and your college is one of these social systems, let us say. Now, I believe, and I've been gathering from—and I've talked to others here—that a social system is basically conservative, and what it wants to do is to perpetuate itself, its model, and its own kind. Now, when you bring in new ideas, this is disrupting to that system, and you get some resistance from it. And therefore, you get the second factor, which is the factor of extreme conservatism—I wouldn't say extreme, but some degree of conservatism in established institutions.

Now, do you consider these to be possible and very serious factors in affecting this?

Dr. Humphries: Your first question I steered away from that purposely because Dr. Brantley is the second speaker—I said when I started my talk I saw this thing as two parts. One, I considered creation of a revolution, and two, if it is effective, how do you get it to move into an institution. Dr. Brantley is going to talk about the thing that you are talking about—how would you get things going—how to deal with it—with all of the things that you are concerned about.

I thought that I tried to be clear about the fact that I viewed the social system of the college very strongly discipline oriented, and that the tendency of everything despite all the innovation that has gone on, essentially it still prevails. If we are going to make a new theory of education, then we have to have a revolution that is ready to reject the old and install the new.

I fundamentally believe—what I said to the people here today is that you have to disclaim allegiance to a discipline. If you don't disclaim allegiance to it, you are not going to do anything effective. You are just simply going to constrain what you are doing to achieve the ends of that which is put in a different fashion.

So, fundamentally, if you are going to find new pathways to better education, one has to break with that extremist social system which is the college thing. And I thought that I said that in my talk.

Comment: The point that I am making is that I resent—and I'll say that as vehemently as you say—I resent the fact that you are trying to say to us that we have to tear down our old houses, live in them, and

build a new one at the same time, which is impossible to do. I would rather have you say to me that "Let's try out a new idea and see if it will work," without having to completely divorce myself from a world that I have to live in, and it creates within me—and I'm using myself as an example—I don't necessarily feel this way—that we have to—you know, we are in a process of change. So if you put me on the defensive immediately, then I am less likely to change than if you give—if you reason with me in a more logical sense.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM CHANGE

Edward Brantley

Curriculum change should involve basic institutional modifications which provide effective results. Consequently, curriculum change relates directly to institutional and academic administrative decisions, priorities, and projections.

Implementation of curriculum change is a process and also an end result. These two factors of implementation are usually acknowledged and easily understood. However, often when the concept is discussed the two factors are used interchangeably and confusion results.

Implementation as a process encompasses the instrumentalities for change. Ideally, this process should begin with original planning. However, the initiation of these procedures occurs at various times during the process of curriculum change.

Implementation as an end product is curriculum change accomplished. This aspect of implementation is the more difficult to be accepted psychologically or professionally by administrators and teaching faculty not involved in the process of curriculum change.

Curriculum change is more than a course revision. Teachers often modify their courses in various ways. These changes are made through changes in methodology, scheduling, or content. The curriculum may or may not be altered through these procedures, and it usually is not.

Curriculum change is profound and comprehensive and causes an institution to be different than it was prior to the change. Consequently, it is a very difficult task to implement curriculum change as an end product.

The Recurrent Nature of Curriculum Change

Various issues are used to support the claim for curriculum change. Fractionalism and the credit-hour system have been causes for support. The low level of intellectual life in the colleges and how the individual is ignored in mass education methods have been topics for discussion on many educational agenda. Equally important has been the time given to discussions, articles, and books regarding the lack of design and unity in the curriculum and the evils of narrow

specialization. The divorce from the vital problems of life and the incriminating testimony from college graduates have also been insightful issues related to the process of change. One would not in such a listing omit the criticisms from students and the basis some consider the core of the total problem, confusion of aims.

The forementioned ideas represent many of the contemporary reasons given as the needs for curriculum change. Many others could be specified and related to this topic. However, it is interesting to note at this point that the ideas expressed were the section headings for Dr. Chen (1, Pp. 3-15) in his monograph published in 1940, and therefore, the research was in process during the 1930's. The reason that these ideas continue to have the forcefulness to cause activity is because no basic curriculum changes have occurred on the majority of campuses in higher education. The lecture method is still the most used form of teaching methodology. The teacher remains in most institutions the center of the academic experiences most of the time. The textbook remains the primary source of knowledge. The structure and organization are basically unchanged even when the first session or semester ends before Christmas, there exist various emphases on course rather than hours, and on the 4-1-4 structure and its modifications.

These are the kinds of shifts that are tolerated by the power structures that control the processes of change. Very few of these institutions are different than they were when the changes were permitted. Evaluations of the outcomes have not shown any meaningful differences. (4) and (6).

Undoubtedly, some of the resistance to change has been explained by Dressel and DeLisle (4, Pp. 75-76). The authors indicate that it was clear from their study, innovation is relative and one college claims as innovation what others are discarding. They also emphasize the fact that there are fads in American higher education and that most of what passes as innovation is really not new. Since many members of faculties are aware of these conditions, they are very reluctant to endorse or approve changes for which supportive evidences of success do not exist.

The history of education clearly denotes the recurring nature of curriculum needs for change and the efforts expended to meet these needs.

Institutional Mission and Implementation

Students and scholars who have studied the history of education are cognizant of the penalties which have been paid and the agonies

endured by those individuals who attempted to implement new curricula that challenged existing and operative curricula, or that attempted to become an integral part of those operations. The conditions of antagonism can be overcome, but not without time, financial resources, resourceful leadership, and an acceptable reason for change.

Dressel and DeLisle (4, p. 77) concur with the basic position of this section which indicates that an institutional mission must be the basis for curriculum change. They have stated reservation, however, relative to the position which will be taken later that the process can be a success. They indicate "A well-planned curriculum, of which an essential part is a statement of objectives and a rationale for the experiences provided, is a necessary structure in which instruction can be appropriately defined in relation to the learning desired. If a faculty cannot or has not been able to agree on a comprehensive curricular design, good instruction will surely be fortuitous. It will also be individualistic in that it will be based on personality factors, and it will be insulated in that each 'good' instructor becomes such by becoming a 'character' rather than by becoming a contributor to a grand design. This view, in this day of faculty specialization, may be impossibly idealistic. The majority of the catalogs studied suggested that it is."

An institutional mission well defined and delimited maps and projects meaningful and constructive institutional approaches. These projections provide the options and choices for change and in some cases will also provide flexibility for experimentation. Most programs that are not implemented have not been a part of such a master plan of an institution. In many institutions there exist no master plan, no plans for the future governance of the institution. Whether or not a well written and documented projection for the institution exists, there are always within an institution plans which give direction for actions.

It is unfortunate at this period of history that so few colleges and universities have the well developed documentation for future development, however, with or without such a document goals are set and implementation for any program component of the institution relates directly to these directional options and alternatives which have been established.

Implementation Components

There are many factors directly related to the process of implementation. Without an effective process for implementation,

implementation as an end-product will not occur.

This section evolves from the belief that an institutional mission exists and one of the goals of that mission relates to the program involving these components. This basis does not eliminate the difficulty to be encountered as implementation proceeds, it only makes the process legitimate within the collegiate environment and within the forums of discussion. Without this support, the program will not receive the respect of those faculty members who invariably categorize institutional change in relation to institutional acceptability.

Financial Support

The most critical factor in program implementation is the financial support for the program. Strangely, many academicians consider the financial support the least important or they move through strange psychological conditions of sublimating this necessity to the processes of philosophy, planning, temporary operations, projections, discussion and frustration. Some even go so far as to say the financial bases are of no concern to them and this supportive area must be handled by others. Individuals who give direction to programs, but think in terms of this latter position seldom implement programs to the posture of an end result.

It is very simple why the financial factor is so very critical for implementation. Institutions, if they are to maintain administrative and academic integrity, must be fiscally responsible. Consequently, changes which occur in terms of facilities, staffing, equipment and the other instrumentalities must be integrated in terms of existing and future resources. There exists no institution to my knowledge which is considered by its administration to possess unlimited financial resources. Therefore, new programs must generate new sources of financial support or compete for existing sources which are in use. In the process of implementation so often it is the latter condition which prevails and consequently so often the existing program is victorious in the struggle for continuity. To the extent that continuous funding can be developed new programs will be implemented until this condition exists. Other programs will continue as long as temporary funds exist for experimental or exploratory purposes, or they will continue to be inoperative projections.

Administrative Support

There are people within each institution who have been delegated the responsibility for policy decisions and implementation. These roles are handled by different individuals bearing different professional titles. However, for this paper, these persons are called administrators. Some of the titles which are held by these individuals, in various institutions, are student, provost, department chairmen, professor, dean, and president.

Also, these individuals and others are often arranged into various groups, committees, assemblies, councils and faculties. Nevertheless, the judgments and decisions made by them individually and collectively determine so often the end result of implementation. Knowledge exists within institutions relative to the various interactions necessary to implement to the point of program integration. It is usually known which individuals and groups have the delegated and the assumed authority to "move things" on campus.

These groups and individuals or their representatives must be a part of the original planning. If this condition is not met, implementation will be delayed at best, but usually it will not occur.

Not only must the initial planning include the people who deal with institutional policy decisions, the lines of communication must be maintained continuously during program development and involvement should be continued whenever possible. It becomes crucial that this involvement obtain during the planning and development of the processes of implementation. There are so many decisions, which must be made regarding financial support, staffing, equipment, facilities and various relationships that only those individuals with specific delegated responsibility have the knowledge and authority to reach a final decision or make reliable judgments relative to probabilities or possibilities.

It is not possible to specify titles or positions in terms of particular institutions. However, for all institutions, the type of administration to which this section refers is always in a position during a meeting for decisions to respond "yes," "no," or "maybe." He seldom finds it necessary to rely upon others of higher authority regarding his authority. This person knows the institutional mission or its plans. This administrator is cognizant of the possible and the probable. Consequently, he is able to provide reliable data which relate to the institutional plans for program implementation.

The Faculty

It is generally held that faculty are interested in being involved in the decision making process of the institution. This is not generally true. Faculty members are not employed to become involved in all aspects of institutional operation. Also, institutional size makes a tremendous difference regarding the expectation and interest of participation, as well as the involvement.

Dykes (5, P. 38) found a pervasive ambivalence in faculty attitudes regarding participation in decision making. Although faculty members overwhelmingly indicated the faculty should have a strong, active, and influential role in decisions, especially, in those areas directly related to the educational functions of the university; they revealed a strong reticence to give the time such a role would require. The faculty also placed participation at the bottom of their professional priority list and deprecated their colleagues who do participate.

The findings by Dykes can be misleading for the person who is uninitiated to the mechanisms of curriculum change and implementation. Implementation involves change and change within an institution affects people. It is at the point of being influenced or bothered by the actions of others that faculty become interested, concerned and involved. They also at this point begin to use their own influence to protect and promote those ideas and causes which are of greatest worth to them. Program implementation will progress to the extent that those persons who have been responsible for the development of the program have marshalled support within the ranks of the faculty. Usually, at the forum of discussion regarding actions to be taken regarding implementation is too late to begin seeking support.

Dykes' (5, P. 42) study also shows the extent to which support can be developed to assist with implementation and how this same support can be used against such a plan. He reveals that his study shows that academic faculty have an "exceedingly simplistic" outlook regarding the distribution of influence and power in their own community. The academicians attributed to the administration greatly more power than it actually possessed. The constraints imposed on the administration internally and externally were not well understood, and the power of countervailing forces was vastly underestimated.

Gross and Grambsch (8, Pp. 28-29) show that the goal "Involve faculty in university government" is ranked 25 out of 47 as a perceived existing condition and 19 out of 47 as a preferred condition. This study

has been involved because curriculum change often relates directly to the governance of an institution. The attitudes held regarding this function direct the perceived involvement to those activities which influence institutional change. The inability to perceive clearly this relationship between institutional government and institutional change often hampers and obstructs the process of implementation.

Institutional Divisions

Many people believe that one component of an institution can function with little regard, and in some instances no regard, for the other components which related to it. This line of reasoning tends to proceed that there should be understanding by the other components regarding the important work in this one specific area. As long as understanding does exist, this unenlightened approach to institutional operation can exist. However, at the point that the director of one of the non-involved components believes understanding does not exist, or never existed, confusion will reign or an impasse of major proportion might very well exist.

An institution is a dynamic, interrelated, organized relationship of various parts; many of which are equal. There seldom occurs within this structure any major alteration which does not affect different components in very meaningful ways. Only to the extent that people within the various division, that are influenced, are knowledgeable regarding their involvement can the operations function in meaningful and constructive ways.

Curriculum change usually relates to many divisions of the institution. What the relationship will be within a particular situation it is difficult to say. However, as this paper is concluded a brief description will be given of one process of change and some end results. Within this situation of change the divisions involved were the Office of the President, the Office of Dean of Instruction, Office of the Business Manager, Office of Dean of Students, Office of Admissions, Office of Financial Aid, offices of the chairmen of the academic departments of Biology, Chemistry, Physics, English, History, Sociology, Social Science, Mathematics, Philosophy, and Humanities.

Even with the involvement of these various areas and their personnel, implementation encountered many difficulties. However, without the involvement of these areas in meaningful ways, the progress which was made would probably not have occurred. Involvement at a

constructive level and communication which explains, is read, and understood are critical areas for implementation.

Implementing Curriculum Change—A Point of View

Changes in curricula begin for various reasons and from various plans. Some of the reasons have been presented. These reasons are often provided through the media of plans. Changes may evolve from institutional self-studies, projections, faculty studies, reviews by consultants, professional developments and new technology and the development of new knowledge. However, often institutions begin their process of curriculum change with an experimental program. The outcomes and the results of this experiment are the bases for determining the future development of the program. Implementation is also dependent upon the outcomes of the experiment. Consequently, change is not based upon a need to change, but on the result of experimentation. Logically followed, if the existing program is to be retained unless the experimental program can prove to be better, then there has not existed a need for change. There has only existed a need to produce something better. There will always be in human existence a need to improve the human condition. Education, and its instrumentalities, is a human condition. This is not the meaning of curriculum change.

Curriculum change as a matter for institutional deliberation only needs to occur when the existing curriculum no longer adequately and constructively produces the kind of educational product desired by the institution, sought by the graduate, and needed by the society. When these conditions exist, there is no need to experiment to determine if the experimental program will be better. What is needed at this point of knowledgeable inadequacy is an academic institutional decision to change. A decision to change not a decision to experiment for change. This decision is very difficult to make if there exists no institutional mission, no goals, no objectives, nor projections. Institutional size has no bearing upon the institutional necessity to develop these positions. The complexity will vary. The divisions of institutional spheres will vary. However, planning is a necessity for all institutions. To the extent that this planning has occurred, the institutional ability to determine action will exist. For those schools that do not have a well developed projection or mission, it will be necessary for them to develop various approaches to ascertain viable options and one of the approaches might

be an experimental program which provides data which should have been available when the necessity for change arose. The pathetic aspect of this approach relates to the fact that the need for change exists and will continue to exist during the period of experimentation and could be in existence if the experiment does not produce results supportive to the institutional needs.

The point-of-view taken by this presentation, for those institutions that do not have the well developed and documented statements of mission, would be to take another approach to change other than the wait-and-see experimental approach. Marshall the best collection of authorities with knowledge concerning the program. These authorities should have knowledge concerning the specific program or have sufficient time to give to study and learn the program to be changed. A new program should be designed and instituted by these knowledgeable individuals based upon their understandings. Included in their plan should be a well defined process for evaluation and feedback which will be used continuously for upgrading and correction. This program should be continued and modified to the point of constructiveness. If this idea is understood, it should be recognized that the program that is initiated may very well not be that which will become constructive. However, the primary need will be met, change. Change not for the sake of change. Change for the sake of educational improvement based upon immediacy and organized design and correction. The only way to change is to want to change and then to change.

Implementing Curriculum Change—One Example

The following case of curriculum change is not presented as a model only as an example of what has worked.

The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program began during the year 1966. During December of 1966, Dr. Samuel Proctor, then President of the Institute for Services to Education (ISE), convened a meeting of institutional representatives from fourteen predominantly black institutions. In attendance were presidents, deans, department chairmen and educational leaders. Also in attendance were the professionals from ISE and educational leaders who had worked with ISE.

The reason for the initial meeting at Newton, Massachusetts was to determine if the institutions would be willing to form a consortium to implement a program of curriculum change in the area of general education. Within a week of the last day of the meeting which lasted

for three days, thirteen of the fourteen institutions had indicated their willingness to cooperate. During the first year of the program there were thirteen schools and during the second year a fourteenth school was added to the original group.

Implementation became a topic of discussion during the first of the program. The process was discussed by the various funding agencies of this experimental approach. These discussions maintained a degree of tension which was to increase in urgency and importance as far as implementation is concerned. The topic was on the agenda of the Council of Presidents which was organized as a continuing group and has existed throughout the existence of the program. Without the presidents in this situation, implementation would have been impossible. Even with the support of the presidents, implementing as a process and an end result has been slow, laborious, and difficult. The assisting agency, ISE, has maintained implementation has one of its major goals. It has developed plans and procedures to assist the institutions during the periods of process and end product. Another group to stress implementation continuously has been the program staff composed of the director, counselor, and teachers. This has been the group having the primary and continuous responsibility for implementation. The one person having the major responsibility of direction and coordination has been the program director on each campus. The director has had the responsibility of putting all of the pieces together into a meaningful manner. This person has been assisted by the various components of the consortium, but day-to-day the responsibility has been that of the director.

Implementation has involved the presidents, business managers, vice-presidents, academic deans, personnel deans, department chairmen, financial aid officers, and directors of admissions and faculty. These individuals on all of the campuses have been directly involved with the implementation process. There have been other individuals on various campuses such as the Title III Coordinator or the development officer. It has been imperative to maintain involvement, communication, and constructive relationships.

Implementation as a process and as an end product have been approved on twelve of the fourteen campuses. Implementation as a process has existed on all of the campuses.

This consortium began its processes from the point of an experiment and then expanded the program into the larger program. The process has taken five years and millions of dollars. Other consortia

have begun the program and their implementation as an end result has been faster with the necessary safeguards of evaluation and corrective feedback.

The program provided the goal-makers the necessary valid and reliable results and consequently, the support for change was not difficult to obtain. Neither was it difficult to obtain the support for implementation as a process. However, on all of the campuses implementation as an end-product encountered difficulty. Only with continuous efforts of constructive interaction with the faculty, president, dean, fiscal officer, was it possible to eventually receive the institutional approval to integrate the program into the structure of the institution.

Conclusion

Implementation is the end-result of philosophy, planning, goal determination, conferences, meetings, rhetoric, and written documents. It represents the work in the trenches after the generals have pondered all of the alternatives and paths of glory. It represents the thought patterns, life experiences, educational involvements of the people who must eventually support the well conceived plans. It involves the best efforts of the leaders of the in-group, the forsaken cliques, the have beens, and the never were.

Curriculum change, which is sufficiently pervasive to change significantly the behavior of large numbers of individuals within educational institutions, is elusive and difficult. The difficulty stems from the fact that established structures emerge for reasons and reasons for change must be more humanly satisfying than existing *raison d'être*.

References

- Chen, Theodore Hsi-En, Developing Patterns of the College Curriculum in the United States. Los Angeles: The University of Southern California Press, Southern California Education Monographs, Number 10, 1940.
- Caffrey, John (Ed.), The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.
- College Entrance Examination Board, The Challenge of Curriculum Change. Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

- Dressel, Paul L. and Frances H. DeLisle, Undergraduate Curriculum Trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.
- Dykes, Archie R., Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Evans, Richard I., Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.
- Graubard, Stephen R. (Ed.), "The Future of the Black Colleges," Daedalus, 100:1971, Summer.
- Gross, Edward and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.
- Long, Margaret (Ed.), New Careers and Curriculum Change. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1968.
- McGrath, Earl J., The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.
- Smith, G. Kerry (Ed.), New Teaching New Learning (Current Issues in Higher Education 1971). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.
- Turner, Joseph, Making New Schools. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.

Discussion

Comment: I would like to make a passing reference to what has been referred to as "anthropological perspective," and I wonder if education—or the educational structure as we know it today—as we have known it all these centuries—is indeed the proper habitat for the kind of change, revolution that we are talking about that's so desirable—I have several reasons for doubting that it is. One is that there are conflicting—not only theories, but also data on the matter of lecture and the value of the lecture.

Professor Bradley, Heywood Bradley of Southern University recently completed a study at my request. The conclusions were not at my request, of course. In that study he found that black students who come to Southern University with weak academic backgrounds—and especially those black students from socio-economic and culturally deprived circumstances—tend to respond best to some form that includes lecturing. I don't know what that means to what you've been saying here. It would seem to me that somewhere along the line all of us here including the organizers of this conference somehow

unconsciously accepted a similar finding or theory because everything we have heard in these three days has been presented to us in the form of lectures—some of them highly entertaining, but lectures nevertheless, and it has always been a matter of listen to what I have to say and then react. Now, I'm not doing this to question your wisdom nor to invalidate your approach. What I'm saying is it seems to me that all of us are prisoners of something that we feel should be changed and we are not mentally, emotionally, intellectually equipped to jump out of our skin and look at ourselves from the outside, and you seem to imply the same thing when you say that perhaps change has to be decreed by a higher authority, and I wonder if the American society and the American public which are paying for education and have been doing so through their noses all these years—I pay my share, of course—and are not just about fed up with the apparent hoax of education all these years, and I condemn myself as well as I do you as my colleagues. I'm not doing this as an exercise in—but I'm really disturbed about it.

I wonder if, as we teach in our classes, in our classrooms, we should not give some thought to the possibility that the longer we keep students in college under our own influence, the less likely those students will be equipped to affect or even formulate the kinds of change that may be necessary for those students' very survival.

Perhaps we need to move in the direction of what I would call ideal education, which would be for a student who is with it today to come to us in our beautiful universities, and within a very short span of time be exposed to all of the wonderful lectures that the best professors can give him, and then let's graduate him out of there as quickly as possible—and this is, of course, not what I mean—but let's get him out where he can really take those ideas and transform them into actions. Because the longer he stays, the more likely he is to become a professional student, a scholar, us.

Comment: I think curriculum change—if I am looking at curriculum change as being reflective of the cumulative experiences of all those persons with whom you work in that institution, and the concrete effort is made, say by the sociology department—I looked around, and I saw that department—I think those persons have changed the curriculum to the point that they have made the bachelor degree with some salable skills after they finish the degree in sociology. Now, that's curriculum change, and I can look at other departments that are just as traditional as they were fifty years ago.

So when you stand there and tell me that I must take it all or

nothing at all, you are telling me you will not change. I just can't buy what you are selling. I didn't come here to take all or nothing at all. I came to look for practical approaches that I can take back to my school and try to enrich my curriculum within the framework of the politics—

Dr. Brantley: The only thing that I would say was that within the school of sociology, that those people should be working together for change, and when they decide that there is a need for their curriculum to change, then they should change without taking a whole lot of time to do it. But what most people want to do—they just want to try to be safe. Most people want a change. You can't hardly ask anyone if he wants to change, and he'll say no. Some people are so satisfied they don't want to change, but they are very few because conditions change which occasion the necessity for change.

So when that condition occurs, then you need—and I will put one more condition on that—I say that you should establish continuously your mission for that department and for that school. That should be an on-going process of self-study, or an institutional study or a departmental study. So when the point of change occurs, you don't have to go back.

I am not saying to jump up and change. That's ridiculous because you don't know what you are going to change to. So you have to have a basis for your change, and I believe that the best process is the on-going study, then when the change comes, you have a plan to put in the place of the one that is going.

Dr. Brantley: Well, your point of view is an accepted position in education, but there are great ideas that shape and mold the lives of men, that these ideas have existed for many many centuries. You can even go back and go into the points of view about the personality of people, you know, if you want to do this. But there are within the culture of man certain kinds of conditions which remain the same for all men in all cultures, and this is one approach.

St. John has a great tradition of education, and the position we take is that it is possible to change, but I think that what we are inadequately communicating to you is that we see this as a process—that we see it as changes, and we see taking the best of what exists and making it a part of this on-going part. We aren't saying to throw out the baby with the wash. We are not saying that at all. And the question is often asked, "Does this mean that we haven't been doing anything good?" I said, "No, that's ridiculous." You can see by your graduates and by the people who relate to you, your constituencies, the kinds of

support that you get, that people still put a degree of confidence and trust in what you have been doing. So it's a matter of taking a lot of difference factors, putting them together. And when you put all these factors together, you have something which is different from what you started.

But there are certain basic things that we say in this process—we would like the teacher to be there because we think within the teacher—And you know we go over to the far side when we talk about the teacher, but we believe in the teacher, that the teacher is a part of the educational process—that he is a part of it—He brings knowledge which the students couldn't possibly have—that he is the organizer of bodies of knowledge which the students couldn't possible have, and that's why you have formal arrangements of education.

I'll tell you something else. We even believe that books are good. We just say don't use them all the time, but use them with other kinds of materials, and when you get through putting all of the instruments together, you come up with something that's different.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Albert Berrian

Dr. Berrian is presently Associate Commissioner of Higher Education, State Education Department, Albany, New York. He was educated at New York University (Washington Square College) (B.A.), New York University (M.A., Ph.D.). Dr. Berrian has held a variety of leadership positions at Hampton Institute, Central State University, Clark College and SUNY.

Elias Blake, Jr.

Dr. Blake is President, Institute for Services to Education. He was educated at Paine College (B.A.), Howard University (M.A.) and University of Illinois (Ph.D.). His career, as a psychologist trained in educational research, includes teaching posts at Miles College and Howard University. Dr. Blake's research articles and essays have appeared in such publications as the Journal of Educational Psychology, Daedalus, Harvard Educational Revue and Journal of Negro Education.

Herman Branson

Dr. Branson is President of Lincoln University, Pennsylvania and President, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. He was educated at Virginia State College (B.S.) and University of Cincinnati (Ph.D.). Dr. Branson is past President, Central State University. He was Professor of Physics, Howard University (1944), later became Head of the department. Dr. Branson is a Trustee of the Carver Foundation.

Edward Brantley

Dr. Brantley is Vice President, Clark College. He was educated at Howard University (B.A.), Columbia University (M.A.) and University of Colorado (Ph.D.). Dr. Brantley is the author of numerous publications in the field of education. Dr. Brantley has compiled a distinguished record of service to higher education including extensive

activity in the Cooperative Intercollegiate Examination Program.

Henry Bullock

Dr. Bullock was Professor of History-Sociology and Chairman of Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Texas. He was educated at Virginia Union University (B.A.) and University of Michigan (M.S. and Ph.D.). Dr. Bullock is the winner of a Bancroft Prize for his scholarly publication, A History of Negro Education in the South (1968).

Harold Delaney

Dr. Delaney is Acting Vice Chancellor for University Colleges, State University of New York and Associate University Dean for University Colleges, State University of New York. He received his B.A., M.S., and his Ph.D. degrees at Howard University. Dr. Delaney was Dean of Morgan State College and Professor of Chemistry at Morgan and North Carolina A & T State University. He is listed in American Men of Science.

Samuel Gould

Dr. Gould is currently Vice President, Educational Testing Service and Chairman of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study. He was educated at Bates College (A.B.), Oxford, Cambridge and Harvard Universities. He is the holder of LL.D. and LH.D. degrees. Dr. Gould is past President, Antioch College and past President, Educational Broadcasting Corporation. He is the author of Knowledge is Not Enough (1959) with S. A. Dimond. Dr. Gould is a member of the Advisory Council on Graduate Education, U.S. Office of Education.

Frederick Humphries

Dr. Humphries is presently Vice President, Institute for Services to Education. He was educated at Florida A & M University (B.S.) and University of Pittsburgh (Ph.D.). He is former Professor of Chemistry at Florida A & M University and University of Minnesota. Dr. Humphries contributed numerous specialized articles to such publications as Photochemistry and Photobiology and the Journal of Physical Chemistry. He serves as Research Professor for the U.S. Bureau of

Mines and consultant for the U.S. Office of Education's Talent Search Program.

C. Sumner Stone

Mr. Stone is presently a columnist with the Philadelphia Daily News. He was educated at Wesleyan University (A.B.) and University of Chicago (M.A.). He was former Director of Minority Affairs, Educational Testing Service. Mr. Stone was Visiting Professor in Government, Trinity College in Connecticut and lectured at Columbia College in Chicago. He was Journalist of the Year (1961) and Outstanding Citizen of the Year (1964). Mr. Stone is a member of the National Portrait Gallery's Advisory Committee on The Afro-American Exhibition for 1972.

Conference Program

CURRICULUM CHANGE IN BLACK COLLEGES

Wednesday, April 19

1:30 – 1:45 p.m.

1:45 – 3:15 p.m.

3:15 – 3:30 p.m.

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

7:00 – 9:00 p.m.

9:00 –

Orientation

NEED FOR A NEW COLLEGE

Dr. Elias Blake, Jr.

Coffee Break

FOCUS OF CURRICULUM REDESIGN IN BLACK COLLEGES

Dr. Henry Bullock

Dinner

NEW DIRECTIONS IN BLACK COLLEGES

Dr. Herman Branson

Social Hour

Thursday, April 20

10:00 – 12:00

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

4:00 – 7:00 p.m.

7:00 – 9:00 p.m.

DE-PAROCHIALIZING GENERAL EDUCATION

Dr. Albert Berrian

Lunch

SOME BASIC ISSUES OF GENERAL LIBERAL EDUCATION

Dr. Harold Delaney

BLACK COLLEGE'S RENAISSANCE; AN ACADEMIC BLUEPRINT FOR THE NEW BLACK STUDENT

Mr. C. Sumner Stone

Resource: Dr. Samuel Gould

Dinner

NON-TRADITIONAL STUDY

Dr. Samuel Gould

Friday, April 21

9:00 – 10:20 a.m.

**FACTORS AFFECTING EFFECTIVE
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENTS**

Dr. Frederick Humphries

10:20 – 10:30 a.m.

Coffee Break

10:30 – 12:00

**IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICU-
LUM CHANGE**

Dr. Edward Brantley

paschal's motor hotel atlanta, ga.